

HOW TO TREAT THE GERMANS

EMIL LUDWIG'S BOOKS

On Germany

THE GERMANS' DOUBLE HISTORY
GOETHE
BEETHOVEN
BISMARCK
WILLIAM II
HINDENBURG

On Europe

NAPOLEON
THREE TITANS
JULY 14
VERSAILLES (*Play*)
LEADERS OF EUROPE
TALKS WITH MASARYK
TALKS WITH MUSSOLINI
THE NEW HOLY ALLIANCE
STALIN
THE MEDITERRANEAN

On America

BOLIVAR
LINCOLN
ROOSEVELT

On Africa

THE NILE

Further

CLEOPATRA
SCHLEIMANN
GIFTS OF LIFE
DIANA
QUARTET

HOW TO TREAT THE GERMANS

BY
EMIL LUDWIG

HUTCHINSON & CO. (PUBLISHERS) LTD.
LONDON : NEW YORK : MELBOURNE

ON THE AUTHOR

EMIL LUDWIG IS ONE OF THE FOUR GERMAN-BORN IMMIGRANTS WHO began his career as a liberal and remained one ever since. At 16 he wrote his first play, *Peace*, at 36 it was he who wrote, as one of the first Germans, for a League of Nations, at 50 he so openly attacked the growing Nazi party that they found it necessary to publish a book of 200 pages against him. *Der Fall Emil Ludwig*. His publication on Mussolini was not a book of praise, but a series of contradictory conversations, which the dictator suppressed after publication. His books *Kaiser Willian II* and *July 1914*, translated into 25 languages, gave the historical foundations for the Weimar Republic.

Ludwig left Germany at 25 without any other reason but to find more freedom in Switzerland, to which he expresses deep gratitude. He became a Swiss citizen, long before Hitler's ascent. He was heard all over the world as a warning prophet. In 1936, on a lecture tour through U.S.A. he warned of the coming war, advocating a boycott against Germany. In 1937 and 1938 he predicted in books and articles the 'imminent war,' but also that Russia would fight at the side of the democracies and that Stalin would remain the only one of the three dictators to outlive the war.

In May 1940 he had to leave Switzerland, then expecting a German invasion, because he was known as public enemy No. 1. For years his house had been spied into by Nazi agents. Since then he continued his fight from the Californian coast.

To-day he warns once more, not to repeat the mistakes of Versailles. He gives a unique characteristic of the Germans, to show the Allies how to treat them after victory. It is not at all too early, because the Allies could be politically as unprepared at Hitler's collapse as they were at Mussolini's.

recently, one of which being a Testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, others being lectures in a Government Institution.

Santa Monica (Calif.)
October, 1943.

LUDWIG.

I

THE GERMAN

"So lordly is the German patriot that he insists that he can stand quite on his own. At the same time he arrogates to himself the achievements of any other nation, insisting that they have all descended from him or that at the very least they are his collateral relatives."

—Goethe.

THE GERMAN CHARACTER IS NOT HARMONIOUS. I CAN EXPRESS THIS best by quoting a German idiom: "Er fühlt sich nicht wohl in seiner Haut." (He does not feel comfortable in his own skin.) The German is never content with his lot. He cannot stand contentment and he is always on the look-out for something better than what he has. He is what he calls a 'Streber' (a place-hunter). In this he is the exact opposite of the American, who has the desire to relax.

The very first thing we hear about the Germans in recorded history is that during the first centuries of our era they left their country in search of a better one somewhere down south. Out of their wild forests they crossed the Alps, commanded by kings or leaders, to find what is now Italy, France, Spain. Neither the English nor the Scandinavians, both of whom followed, began their wanderings so early or stuck to them quite so long. For centuries the Germans have been marching south, attempting again and again to conquer for themselves the sun-blessed fruits of the Mediterranean. At first they came wrapped in hides, wearing heads of wild animals as helmets; later under the kaisers they arrived in steel armour; later still they came as artists, poets, thinkers.

All documents, medieval and modern, prove that their wanderings were only partly inspired by the lust for power and the need for slaves. They left their woods driven by an inherent feeling of unrest.

A strange lack of self-assurance makes the Germans desire power over others, but also acknowledgment by others. These others, the peoples of the Mediterranean, possessed richer countries and higher cultures. One thousand years after Athens had built her Acropolis, the Germans still were following the bear into virgin forests, still were barbarians, had no record of their history. During these first centuries of their appearance in civilized Europe, they had already developed the dominating qualities which they exercise to-day: they

made their way by overpowering their richer neighbours; they built up a hierarchy with masters and servants; they trained their youth to courage and obedience.

A man who is sure of himself does not trouble much about impressions he makes upon others. The German, who is never sure of himself, has always been asking, in every walk of life, throughout his history: "What do others think of me?" He is like a man who, entering a party, keeps on pulling his tie and adjusting his waistcoat, even though nobody is looking at him.

There are two sublime expressions of this fundamental trait to be found in German art: one, the famous song by Franz Schubert, 'The Wanderer', ending with 'Dort wo Du nicht bist, dort ist das Glück' (Where thou art not, there happiness is); the other is 'Faust', the national poem dramatized by Goethe, the story of a magician who having learnt all the knowledge of the world, nevertheless can nowhere attain happiness and rest, although he hunts for them all his life. 'To hunt for the moment,' the insatiable desire to outdo even the happiest moment, gives a clear picture of what the average German suffers and experiences throughout his life. He wants honour, to be esteemed; power, to show his strength, both physically and intellectually. Honour and power, these two, have a hold upon his soul much stronger than money. Quiet enjoyment of the good things of life is never his aim. Even the Hitler-youth of to-day does not dream of better cars, more food, or a bigger bank account, but of greatness, power, conquest.

These are fundamental feelings that have become a creed with Germans, a mystic belief. The strange existence of a so-called 'Roman Empire of the German Nation' is unique in history: a strong people searched for and found their apex in a foreign country. For nearly a thousand years the German kaisers marched south in search of Rome, later followed by intellectuals in search of spiritual greatness.

The lack of natural self-assurance, never admitted, brought forth two desires: to conquer the happier neighbour, and after that to idealize the conquest. Thus, brutality and mysticism living side by side made the Germans a nation of conquerors and a nation of musicians. Bismarck, one of the most fascinating Germans, once said to one of his friends, "Music always arouses two very distinct desires in me: one is war; the other is idyllic rest." In the most brilliant of German emperors, Frederick II, (who lived in the thirteenth century) both these sentiments united, making him a great conqueror as well as a poet and a scholar—and also in Beethoven, whose idyllic adagios are mostly followed by victory marches. A dangerous mixture

of these two temperaments—though weaker and less sincere—is the element of Richard Wagner's music. It is significant and very enlightening for a non-German that Hitler is a Wagnerian, seeking not relaxation but inspiration.

German arrogance and self-glory emerge from the same source as their passion to serve. Lack of self-assurance has brought about the development of a passion to command on one hand, and to obey on the other. They conceive their state as a pyramid, each man being a stone and carrying another stone on his shoulder; he does this quite patiently, because he can put his whole weight upon another man standing below him. This is how their passion for obedience has developed, their joy in standing at attention in front of a superior, a passion which no modern nation has ever known to such a degree.

From ancient times the Teutons were a militant race, and so they were easily trained into efficient soldiers, strong and obedient. As a soldier the German has always found satisfaction, to-day as well as of old, and this for two thousand years. He loves to be feared, he likes to be esteemed, but he lacks the inherent feeling of harmony which other people have. He cannot relax because he is not self-content; he is always in search of a higher rank or title, even if he has no need for them. He jealously looked across the frontier of his rich neighbour France, not because the French fruits and wines were not his, but because he disliked seeing the French enjoying the good things of life in peace and not at all troubled by what was going on across the Rhine in Germany.

The idea of the pyramid was not at all limited to public life and government. From the barracks it entered every branch of civilian life: the citizens', the student's, the working-man's, the official's.

So the Germans realize a latent distrust which manifests itself by continuous grumbling. The German's dwelling-house, the pyramid, has to be constructed very accurately, the God on top of it has to be a just one. If one of the stones believes himself to be the slightest bit out of place, or believes that he is carrying too heavy a load, he protests immediately: not for liberty's sake, and not at all for himself, but to make certain that any little benefit which someone outside of this iron order of rank might have secured be taken away from him.

Obedience and pedantry increase one another. The magnificent organization of the Germans, over which every individual watches jealously just as people watch over their liberty in other countries,

makes any cordiality impossible. It creates tension everywhere, in every office, public car, even in the elevator, where one man would kill the other one just by staring at him, should it seem that the other was taking up too much space. In no other city in the world are there so many thousands of little encounters in daily life as there are in Berlin, in a revolving door, in parking the car, about the use of hair tonic in a barber shop, over an account of six pence more or less on the lunch check, and many such items as I have noticed them years before the nervousness of the first World War had set in. Just as in the executive offices of a bank the two directors at all events distrust each other, likewise the fourteen-year-old office boys back in the mailing-room watch jealously over one another so that none of them should get an extra five minutes for lunch.

This explains the peculiar German phenomenon—nowhere else to be found—that during any given argument between authorities and the citizens, the onlookers invariably take the side of the authorities. The ‘esprit de corps’ is concentrated upon the state; it is presumed *a priori* that the God is right. Hence the fright of witnesses at court, where they talk in a way that would please the judge, in order to gain his favour.

This attitude also explains the age-old belief in the infallibility of the German general staff. While the French take it for granted that their prime minister or field marshal will, first of all, be wrong all along—and are therefore for ever inclined to revolt—the Germans advance unlimited credit to their kings and *führers*, and they are ready to fight anyone as a Mucker or *Nörgler* (nagger) who dares to criticize their action. Even when everything is lost and the responsibility for the disaster is clearly on the side of the leaders, as in 1918, the German will nevertheless place all the blame on his equals and on himself, in order to prove the Infallibility of his God: the State. There was no hatred for the run-away Kaiser, and the defeated culprit, Marshal Hindenburg (culprit because he had continued a hopeless fight against his better judgment), was elected the Kaiser’s successor—in order to save the pyramid.

Students in Oxford and students in Heidelberg learned very much the same things with more or less zeal on either side. But the youngest student in England or an average American college boy strolled across the campus, their heads high, free from pose or strain! The German boy would have to be continually at the orders of another boy, one who happened to be one or two terms longer on the campus.

It is not by chance that the Germans have developed a race of police dogs who have the same character and lead almost the same

life as their masters, always at the command of the boss and furiously attacking anyone they are ordered to attack.

It is important to study tone, gestures, expressions of a German standing at attention before his superior. There is no dislike to be seen on him, but a tension of happy expectancy to get an order and to be able to execute something. The superior, on the other hand, shows his satisfaction playing the almighty who even has the power to be gracious now and then. If a man can climb high enough on the pyramid of public life so that he might catch a glimpse of the leader's shoe soles—be it a kaiser or be it a *führer*—he then feels that life is worth living.

Wherever there is a crowd of Germans there must be police, to keep order. The first time I was in England I saw thirty people standing in a row at the side of a bus that was bound for the races. They were waiting for its door to open. I thought I was in Utopia, because it all happened without any policeman being around. In America, a train conductor is a help to the passengers; in Germany he is their superior. When he bellows out that the occupants of a car are to show their tickets, one is reminded of a prison guard calling 'Attention!' in sergeant-like manner. When he looks at a ticket that is out of the usual, one is reminded of the secret police. But if he actually discovers a ticket which is not valid for that trip, then one is reminded of the satisfied examining judge who has at last convinced the accused of his guilt.

The German is used to the fact that when three or four others join him, they get organized. That is the way they were educated. But when a German has no more superior, he loses all his sense of order. When the Germans are left without police, when they are allowed to do what they please, then they feel as if an earthquake or a flood had destroyed all their rules of life. Then all ties are loosed, and they act like children without teachers. How could the Germans wish for freedom—how could they even maintain it? They will neither be able to vote nor to govern themselves before having been slowly educated for it.

In his remarks about the Germans, Tacitus, shortly after Christ, said that they were ready to die for their leader. Men of this type have, of course, a character predestined for militarism, which developed more and more, just like the characteristics of a race dog develop more and more by breeding and training.

In such a character lies the source of pedantry. General Montgomery was well aware of this when he spoke of the ease with which he defeated Rommel in Africa. He said: "I knew how

Rommel had done it before—and the Germans always repeat themselves."

Of course the Germans have a private life of their own like all of us, but they live it in their innermost family circle only. With friends or colleagues they somehow always remain in a state of tension: Who is higher than I? Whom do I have to greet first? Or who is to greet me? Who is entitled to precedence? All committees, clubs, schools, are organized according to this plan of the pyramid, and the question of priority is of importance at the dinner table just as much as it is at a cabinet meeting.

At home, however, a German can become quite human, 'gemütlich' (which, literally, means soulful), as he calls it. Oh, yes, at home he is very much like others, relaxed. He likes to play with his children, attends to his dogs, and waters his garden. He reads—or used to read—a lot. His desire to learn stems partly from curiosity, partly from the urge to outdo his neighbour or friend. Competition will always be where Germans live.

With the food in his home it is the quantity which counts more than the quality. He even despises the French for giving so much time and thought to food. But, nevertheless, the German is an excellent host. Germany and Russia are the most hospitable countries in Europe.

Since the German is less dependent upon ease and comfort than the anglo-Saxon, he is given to seek relaxation in dreams; here it is that music comes in, the most profound expression of the German's inner life. No other people, not even the Hungarians and Czechs, have so much music in their homes. Music is the finest expression which the Germans find for the mystic trait in their character. In Austria, much less soldier-spirited, music was created and re-created in its most sublime form, in homes and societies and by all classes of the people.

Another outlet for the romanticism within them the Germans find in travel, in their longing for the south and its milder climate. Conscious of their ponderous nature, they were always attracted irresistibly by the gaiety and sunshine of the Mediterranean. While they despise the Mediterranean people for their modest, antiquated habitations, their complacency and easy-going attitude, they envy their grace, something which the Germans lack. German literature and music are filled with the desire for grace and beauty. Thus the Mediterranean travels of German artists to-day are being caused by the same motives as the campaigns of German emperors during the middle ages.

Women have played a less important part in the inner growth of

German civilization than they have in other countries. No great love poem exists to inflame the heart of the whole nation like *Tristan and Isolde*, the letters of *Heloise and Abelard*, or the love poems of the *Brownings*. There are no counterparts to *Louis XV and Madame Pompadour*, *Dante and Beatrice*, *Paolo and Francesca*. The conflict of the great German legend, '*The Nibelungen*', centres around a contest of honour and precedence. *Brunhild and Kriemhild*, the two heroines, quarrel at the church entrance over which one should enter first.

No royal mistress was ever popular or wielded influence in Germany, no queen ever made a name for herself, except the Empress *Maria Theresa of Austria*. There are no celebrated lovers whose memory was kept alive by the people, not even *Goethe and Fru von Stein*. The only ruler in a thousand years whom the Germans forced to abdicate was a Bavarian king who had given his heart to a beautiful dancer. *Rahel Varnhagen and Cosima Wagner*, the only two German women in the nineteenth century who influenced eminent men, were both of Jewish descent.

In a country where every man feels that there is someone above him, two qualities cannot develop because they are fundamentally democratic: trust and liberty. Without them intrigues are the order of the day and fear can influence minds and hearts of men. Where it is virtue to obey and greatness to command, liberty is not in demand. When it came to them for the first time in 1918, the Germans felt somehow like the slaves of the South when they were given their freedom after the American Civil War.

In such an atmosphere the state becomes an idol: a *Golem*, the unknown God of ancient times. And as of old the priests endeavoured to keep alive all the superstitions with which to increase His power, German princes favoured the expression: Throne and Altar. The Lutherans became the most loyal subjects because Luther, whose revolution called Reformation, dethroned the Pope and gave unlimited power to the princes, making them heads of the new Church. They, from then on, paid the priests. Only the Catholics in the south remained more independent of their worldly rulers because they maintained their spiritual leaders in a far-off country. The most intimate human feelings, the relation to God, were thus used as an instrument to increase the power of the state. This attitude became a creed, the kings became part of it, and finally it was made into a state law.

French as well as English history contains quite a number of records telling about grave conflicts between kings and their subjects, conflicts that often developed into revolution and ended with the kings being

dethroned and sometimes even beheaded. But in a thousand years the Germans never had a genuine revolution. Each one of their three so-called revolutions lasted a few days or weeks and brought about terrible reprisals upon the people. These revolutions were: the Peasants' Revolution in 1525; the Revolution of 1848 in Vienna, Berlin and other cities; and the last of them, the downfall of the monarchy in 1918, a revolution that in reality only consisted of the running away of twenty-two princes. It ended fourteen years later with the ascendance of Hitler. None of these revolutions succeeded, because the German people prefer order to liberty, and taking commands to taking responsibility.

When I visited in December, 1918, about ten capitals of the kingdoms and duchies of Germany, the different citizens proudly declared to me that their prince had been among the last to abdicate.

This world of order and obedience has, nevertheless, developed some good qualities. The precision that the Prussian kings beat into their soldiers, by teaching them the goose-step and how to polish buttons enabled a man, after three years of training, to put the same precision and team-work into the making of the most accurate lenses, the finest cameras, the best-balanced chemical solutions.

But the romantic and musical aspect of the Germans' character has always been much weaker than their adoration of the State and, above all, of uniforms. The youngest office boy felt a pride in belonging to the hierarchy and admired those above him who wore stripes on their sleeves. The uniformed post office clerk would frown should you dare to make a joke. Behind his counter he ceases to be an individual and becomes a wheel in a gigantic machine. Of that he is prouder than he is of his three fine sons.

The feeling for individual responsibility is so great in America that every clerk in a ticket office has a plate with his name on his desk in order that the public should know who he is. Just the opposite is the case in Germany: while in offices everyone is anonymous. At school the son of the teacher would not dare to talk to his father about a personal matter. I cannot after fifty years forget the fear creeping into me when as a boy I found myself waiting for the post-office clerk, in front of his closed window. My back still straightens when I talk to someone in office as it used to automatically when I noticed a uniform. I also remember the two lieutenants in our Silesian town who passed me and my sister, a pretty girl of twenty, on a narrow pavement. In order to make room for them, because uniforms should pass first, they took her hand and led her off the curb.

Of course, men and women in Germany resent such things when

they happen to them, but no one would dare to speak in protest. The policeman, and even the doctor, cease to be individuals as soon as they are on duty.

It is very worth while to watch the procession that followed the chief physician on his daily rounds at the hospital he 'commanded.' Shouting his orders in a loud voice, he marched through the corridors like a sergeant, his white doctor's coat flying behind him, followed by three or four assistants and a few nurses. He entered the wards, wearing a condescending smile or the sombre look of the master of life and death. Then he trumpeted out his orders to his assistants and out he marched with the same bluster, leaving the patient relieved to see the end of the invasion. I saw patients sit up in their beds and make a gesture of reverence to a superior. If things like that go on for hundreds of years, how can the idea of liberty grow to become a creative force? How could there be co-operation, how could fairness play a part?

The Germans do not even have a word for 'fair,' just as they have no word for 'gentleman.' Both of these words were incorporated into the rich German language in their English forms. The Germans, trained to be soldiers, lack the Anglo-Saxon sportive spirit and joy in games; they are a nation without hobbies.

In 1914, the first English prisoners taken by the Germans held out their hands to their German guards. The Germans did not shake hands. They didn't know that one could smile to a defeated foe. During the last Olympiads in San Francisco and Amsterdam, some very unpleasant scenes took place with Germans who had lost. They could not stand the idea of being beaten, and very rudely questioned the impartiality of the umpires.

This lack of tolerance favoured anti-Semitism. Why did the persecutions we have witnessed happen in Germany? Why not in England, where the Jews have been living as long as in Germany, and where they are nearly as numerous and as rich? The Anglo-Saxon, self-assured and balanced, acknowledges a stranger's merits if he is useful and peaceful. It has happened in England that a Jew became Prime Minister, and another one Viceroy of India. But the Germans, on the other hand, have always been jealous of these 'foreigners,' although making use of them, and for a thousand years every century has seen persecutions and outbursts against German Jews.

Goethe compared the Jews with the Germans and said the Germans "should be disseminated all over the world like the Jews to disperse the good that is in them," meaning that neither German nor Jew possesses the qualities necessary to found great states.

Hitler, also, compared the Jews with the Germans, and paid an even greater compliment to the Jews, exclaiming, "There are only two strong races, the Germans and the Jews. That is why I want to exterminate the Jews."

Not the millions which the Jews owned, but the many Nobel prizes which they won, fostered anti-Semitism within the modern German. The German public maliciously attacked the Jews and denied recognition of their talents from the very moment that the Jews were free to show them.

* * * * *

And yet ! If the idea of liberty is inherent in the human mind as is the idea of God, the Germans also went in search of freedom, but in their own peculiar way. They found it in another region of their complex character, far removed from reality ; an idea of liberty flows through their dreams, through their poetry. They sang symbolic verses to liberty :

“Magst Du nie Dich zeigen
der bedrängten Welt,
führst Deinen Reigen
nur am Sternenzelt.”

(Which is as much as to say that liberty exists among the stars only, not on earth.)

Here it is where the fateful dissension between mind and state begins, which has decided the history of the Germans for centuries. With a very few exceptions the governing class of the Junkers, counts, and princes always remained soldiers with little culture, entirely satisfied with power and command. The simple citizens, on the other hand, the objects of the governments, not its creators, who were excluded from this government and had no right to vote until 1867, turned their attention to business, science and art. So for centuries the classes remained strangers, with no understanding between them : a class of uncultured but powerful officers and statesmen, and a class of cultivated and powerless subjects.

The world at large watched this spectacle and could never understand why the very same people which produced marvels of music, literature and science also produced aggressive wars every century.

By tradition and education the nobility produced excellent officers, but the lack of intellectual training made for poor statesmen and diplomats. This is the reason that a great nation of soldiers, winning wars and widening their boundaries, was governed by leaders with little political insight. Here lies the source of the eternal discord between statesmen and thinkers, between mind and government in Germany. This schism is quite unique in history.

Society in Germany works a little like a New York Fifth Avenue Bus. Below, a lone man drives the bus, uncontrolled; on the platform above, artists and scientists are sitting comfortably and enjoying the view, not caring whether their leader down there knows how to drive at all. If he doesn't, if the car topples over, then the gentlemen are surprised.

True, in America, too, there was a difference of ideas between old Emerson and his contemporary, the young Theodore Roosevelt. But in this country, the contest between theory and action never was a deep-rooted one. In Europe Queen Elizabeth favoured Shakespeare; the Sun King, Louis XIV of France, favoured Racine; the Popes of Rome and the Italian princes were always patrons of the finest arts and the most advanced sciences.

In Germany during a period of five hundred years some lesser princes amused themselves by bestowing favours upon great intellectuals of their time. But the powerful Hohenzollern never acknowledged intellectual values except those which would serve their own purpose. From Kepler down the ages to Einstein, a genius was never legitimately acknowledged. Hans Holbein went to England; Albrecht Dürer to Italy. Only some German cities now and then patronized genius.

The most surprising thing about this division is the indisputable fact that the citizens did not want to govern. They were very happy living, as it were, on a dream-island with their philosophy, music, and science. They saw the ship of state pass by. They might have waved at it, but they were glad to let princes and kings do the governing so that they themselves might be left in peace to do their dreaming and to do their work.

In other countries, in Czarist Russia, for instance, some unruly intellectuals rebelled from time to time, were shot or deported. Eminent poets and revolutionaries came from the nobility and fought for freedom. Germany alone has no monument to a hero of liberty; it can boast of no martyrs. In the five hundred years succeeding Luther's Reformation, there were only two of them: Hofer and Blum. Nobody in Germany knows the names of the killed revolu-

tionaries of 1848; but every general who has ever conquered a town has a popular name.

The dissension of mind and government continued for centuries. When the empire's wars of conquest were successful, German intellect was absent; but at times when the Reich was split by dynasties and powerless, art and science flourished and influenced the world. The natural meeting place of those representing mind and those representing power should have been the universities, some of which are among the oldest in the world. But since Germany knew no private foundations, these centres of science were sustained for the better part of the last five hundred years by the princes, who also selected and paid the professors.

It is true that eminent doctors, chemists, and other scientists came from these universities, but the teaching of philosophy, religion, history, was always controlled by and subordinated to the interests of the princes. The German scientist might publish the most revolutionary theories about cancer or tuberculosis, but he was forbidden to write freely on state, philosophy, liberty, and politics. The professors were the servants of the princes.

For these reasons, Hegel, the originator of the deification of the state idea, was influential in Berlin, while Schopenhauer, his greater contemporary, remained a solitary hermit.

After Luther, Kant gave the most striking example of what depths a great man can descend to, when he is threatened by those who hold power. As long as he taught metaphysics too abstract for Junker-brains they left him in peace. They also ignored his 'Eternal Peace,' a sort of proposal of a League of Nations, in which he praised English and French governmental systems. But when Poland was cut up under his very eyes, Kant held his tongue. When later he defended religious freedom, he was told by the king of Prussia in no uncertain terms to shut up or be dismissed. This great genius, who held a world in his brain, did not dare to send his protest to the king who, by the way, was one of the most stupid rulers in history. Kant wrote the answer, but locked it safely away in the drawers of his desk, where his pupils found it after his death.

The Germans have produced some good historians, but on foreign history only. There they were at liberty to criticize, but they were not independent enough to sit down and write an unbiased history of their own nation. Mommsen advocated the extermination of the Czechs. Another leading 'liberal' historian of about 1900, Lamprecht, wrote a Panegyricum on William II only a short time before the Kaiser ran away.

The dependence of intellectuals upon a government which was in the hands of uncultured militarists often induced the finest minds to pour their bitterness into private letters, but these were published only years after their deaths. Every nation has been and should be criticized by the very best brains it produces. The world chaos which we have to go through just now came about because the opposite had become the fashion, that every nation felt it its duty to exaggerate in praising its own virtues and talents. And yet there is hardly a nation capable of such bitter sarcasm concerning its own character as are the Germans. One can notice that by the expressions of their finest intellects from Luther down to Nietzsche.

There were, however, some rare exceptions in this schism of state and mind in Germany.

As long as he lived, Goethe was involved in the problems of Thought and Action, of Dream and Reality. Into the small realm of the Duchy of Weimer, where he served as prime minister to a young Duke that admired him, he tried to introduce some liberal ideas even before the French revolution. This essay cost him ten of his most productive years and ended in the bitter conviction that there was no room for a tolerant government anywhere in Germany.

Schiller became the poet of liberty in the eyes of the German public, and Goethe was seen as a nobleman who had spent his life as the intimate friend of princes and courtiers, which he never was. Therefore, the opinions held in other countries about him are completely distorted. We have many bitter judgments by this greatest of all Germans, about his country and his countrymen. We quote a few only at the head of the chapters of this book.

Another man who tried to govern Germany as an intellectual was Wilhelm von Humboldt. But in Prussia, where a tradition of force was even more intrenched than anywhere else, this could not even last for ten years, but only for ten months. And when twenty years ago, and for a third time, a man of genius arose and tried to conduct a German government, he was murdered by the Nazis barely five months after taking office. He was the best man whom the German republic produced: Walther Rathenau.

In America the founder of the United States left behind him thirty-seven volumes; Jefferson and Franklin were also writers, and Wilson became President mainly because of his writings. In England it is taken for granted for a statesman to have been at Oxford, to know the classics, to have written books. In France, the tradition from Richelieu to Herriot was that art, literature, philosophy, were excellent stepping stones for a political career.

In Germany there is nothing of the kind. The generals, at least the popular ones, were rough and tough fellows like Blücher. There is only one exception, Moltke, a Dane by birth. Hindenbug had not only never learned anything, but was proud of this fact; his boast was that he had never read books, except military ones.

When the chancellor on August 2nd, 1914, had to explain the declaration of War by the Kaiser in the Reichstag, he received overnight the title of a colonel and a uniform, because a war chancellor without uniform would have seemed ridiculous to the Germans.

This anti-intellectual tendency of those in power, and the unrealistic attitude of German intellectuals, explains the strange fact that a nation so rich in poetical talent did not produce a national drama. The greatest German playwright, Schiller, produced seven or eight historical plays, but only one concerns itself with German history. Faust is, perhaps, the only figure that could be called a national one. There are no comedies of the significance of those by Molière or by Shakespeare, because the German as a type lacks sense of humour, or he is for ever on the look out, like Faust, for the one moment of harmony.

These are some of the reasons for the fundamental schism in the German character. There are, of course, others, caused by climate, geographical circumstances, and the course of history.

II

THE PRUSSIAN

"Take care, it's a Prussian; they always
believe they are cleverer than other
people." —Goethe.

GERMANY HAS TWO TYPES THAT STRIKINGLY REPRESENT HER TWO extremes: Prussians and Austrians. This has by no means been just a contrast between two royal houses. If it had ever been, it should not be now, twenty-five years after the disappearance of all princes. The climate in these two parts of the country differs greatly. Half-southern Austria, land of fruit, wine, beautiful landscape, created a people more similar to the Italians than to the Germans. The pure Catholic education, the merging of various tribes, the geographical

position of Vienna as a crossing point of commerce from north to south and east to west, favoured an international outlook. A mixed civilization, an easier and, consequently, more easy-going life, has made these Austrians less militaristic, more artistic, gentler; in other words, more amiable in every respect than their brothers of the north. Their land became the home of music.

The Hapsburg did not create this temperament, but they symbolized it. Although they lost most of their wars, their empire nevertheless grew by marriages and advantageous, clever treaties. Women played a great part in every phase of Austrian life, and in the house of the rulers the examples were set. From Austria there came a dozen German kaisers; they intermarried with other European royalty, and while the Hapsburg did not produce more than three great rulers over a period of six hundred years, their family occupied the throne longer than any other ruling dynasty.

On the other, the northern, end of Germany lies Prussia, a land of sandy plains which could be changed into fields of rye, potatoes, and vegetables only by an extremely industrious and frugal people. There is no wine in this country, few beautiful landscapes, and fruit is scarce. Here we have prose, as compared to the music and idyllic landscapes of Austria. A mixture of north-Slavic races, the mostly un-German Wends and Prussians, colonized these rough lands under the rule of the landowners called Junkers.

The royal family, the Hohenzollern, emigrated from southern Germany exactly five hundred years ago. They inherited and partly conquered what later became Prussia, but they did not bring with them the memory of southern charm.

Berlin, founded more than a thousand years after Vienna, in an isolated and unfavourable spot, could not by itself develop either commerce or culture, and least of all art and music. The Prussians were and remained the most prosaic Germans.

The poverty of the Prussians, the necessity to lead an industrious, spartan life, naturally developed, with the need for expansion, warrior instincts. The great landowners became aristocrats and most effective rulers, as was true everywhere in Europe at that time. But there were no travellers who would come to tell the hardworking serfs on these sandy open spaces what liberties the towns on the Rhine or in parts of Austria possessed. There was little communication with other Germans, and no Prussian elector or king was ever named kaiser for 400 years. Under the circumstances, no opposition arose against the ruling classes. The feudals, as good officers, stood behind their kings, but demanded and received as rewards more prerogatives

than they would have been given in any other feudal government. These Junkers dominated army and government. The only rights which the commoners had were the rights to work for their lord and to die for their king. They had never known any other form of political life.

The citizens and the peasants had to serve in the army not for three, but often for thirty years, and that still under Frederick the Great. A peasant was permitted to go home for a period of four months every year in order to take care of his fields and to beget new soldiers for his king. The most humiliating position in all Germany was that of the Prussian commoner, who had no access to the machinery of justice. He was completely dependent upon the brutal will of his boss, and not even his Lutheran priests—paid by the Junkers—would dare to defend him against it. In this most effective way every Junker was a little autocratic king over his estate, had power over life and death, and held in his hand the very existence of all of his subjects, just like the Nazi gauleiters of to-day.

This system was continued until the nineteenth century. Even after Russia and the United States had abolished slavery, serfdom in East Prussia continued. The Junkers called it patriarchic; the poor masses called it God's will; historians call it slavery. In such an atmosphere, the development of neither culture nor liberty was possible. Prague and Vienna had had their universities for hundreds of years, Berlin did not have one before 1810. Since Luther himself had installed the princes as the chiefs of their country's churches, the Prussian electors and kings could wield a much greater power over their subjects than could the Catholic princes. They completely controlled all schools and universities.

The regulations of militaristic life were not at all restricted to the barracks of the Army. Military discipline was felt everywhere. Up to the nineteenth century, independent studying for commoners was rare in Prussia, as well as public theatres and music halls such as Austria gave her masses, where people could relax and be merry in public. The spirit of military obedience that emanated from the drilling grounds entered the back door of every house and the heart of every citizen, and this continued up to our day. Little children three years of age were strutting about in uniforms, playing with wooden guns and wearing helmets. We school children had to snap to attention like soldiers when answering a teacher's question. Up to this day it strikes a real Prussian as something out of order when he sees an American boy sitting in a chair and chewing gum while talking to his professor.

The adoration of the uniform was general in every walk of life, not only at the time of Frederick the Great but up to the time of my own youth under William II, when every maid or cook who respected herself would have to have a soldier in uniform to go out with, or the daughter of a rich man had to go skating with a lieutenant.

Professors of world-wide fame had the words, 'Lieutenant of the Reserve,' printed on their visiting cards, right under their famous names. They announced the birth of a son in the newspapers, in the following way: 'Born, a new healthy soldier for the Kaiser.' The happiest day for a Prussian professor was the emperor's birthday, because on this day, once a year, he was permitted to appear in public as a member of the privileged classes. He could press his bulging waistline into his old uniform which he had worn through the happy years of his military service, and he could parade up and down the streets showing off with all the decorations he possessed.

Most Prussian government officials wore a uniform. In his dealings with civilians he always applied a military tone of command. Every teacher, every post-office clerk did the same. This rattling bluster was not the result of an inborn brutality. Even the soft-hearted among the Germans felt it a duty in fulfilling their sacred task of serving the State to talk like arrogant lords or brutal sergeants to the poor, anonymous 'subject' buying stamps or paying taxes. An insurmountable wall separated the man in uniform from the less honourable rest of the nation. I was greatly surprised when I once received a letter from an English tax board, signed with the courteous words: 'Your obedient servant.' Any letter written by the most obscure official in Germany to a world-known celebrity or to the general manager of a world-known corporation would have no salutation and would start off like this: "You are requested to report (or to see, or to appear, or to pay, etc.)," and it would invariably end with simply the word 'Signed,' and the clerk's illegible name.

* * * * *

The Hohenzollern, who flourished by such systems for about five hundred years, produced only three gifted rulers during this time, as against seventeen mediocre ones, which were spendthrifts and spartans alternately. With their army, founded in about 1650 by the 'Great Elector,' they enlarged their territory by threats and also by conquests, but especially and most successfully by betraying their German neighbours to foreign powers. The result of this policy was that in the nineteenth century all the other German states were reduced to

impotence. Only the Austrians remained as possible rivals, but, by temperament and education, they were in no way the Prussians' equal as soldiers.

The Prussian system of army and government was inaugurated and organized by the father of Frederick the Great, the so-called 'Soldier-King,' who happened to be a much more solid and honest man than his problematic son. His reign was naturally a military tyranny, but mitigated by strictest economy, and free from personal ambition. Not Frederick the Great, but his father, should be called 'first servant of his state'. It was he who devised and developed a well-working state administration. He fought against rebellious Junkers and created an army of tremendous size, consisting of 83,000 men.

The military education of youth which he inaugurated was a brutal one which made use of the stick and even of torture, but the Prussians did not dislike it. They never revolted, and finally were moulded into the obedient and efficient soldiers the Soldier King had dreamed of. Such education, which in fact was nothing more than a military drill, created the desire to fight for fighting's sake, and the soldiers didn't know and didn't care why or against whom they marched into battle. Small wonder that such an army should develop an offensive spirit rather than a defensive one. And this explains the fact that Germans in general are bad losers. Brilliant as the army often was while attacking, they have never shown great morale during retreats.

After the conclusion of Frederick II's classical campaigns, the Germans lost only two wars: the first was the one against Napoleon, in 1806, a complete defeat in which little serious resistance was offered the French; the second was the First World War; in 1918 no preparations had been made for a possible retreat or for the defence of the inner line. Holding half of Europe, they gave up within twenty-four hours. The same thing will happen next year.

For over three hundred years the Prussian soldier has been educated to obey without understanding why. In spite of all modern propaganda, in spite of radios, he is to-day not better informed because in his country he is only told one side of the story, as there is no critical press to stimulate public discussions. The old Prussian idea 'Kadaver Gehorsam' (dumb obedience) still stimulates dashing and brilliant attacks, but cannot give the soldier intelligence and moral strength in defence.

The reign of the Soldier King was the most stupid one that Europe has known for centuries—with the exception of Hitler's. Every manifestation of culture, every refinement of civilization he called 'Orgies of Sardanopalos,' he indulged in one delight only: his army. But

he did not risk to realize fantastic dreams for world domination or for the supremacy of a selected race. He raised a splendid army but he did not start wars. He stayed at home like a good housewife, to keep things in shape. Immediately upon his death the young Frederick could not restrain himself from using his father's magnificent war machine. He began a war against Austria, a war, as he confessed later, which was entirely improvised by ambition. This war was followed by another, and for twenty long years war followed war. When finally all these 'glories' ended, he had acquired a poor province—Silesia—and that at the cost of one million men.

Americans in general hold a rather distorted picture of Frederick the Great, which has done much to give them a very wrong idea of Prussia. Because Frederick favoured the American Revolution for a while, being an enemy of England, he was hailed there as a hero; because he courted Voltaire for a time, he was believed to be a liberal; because von Steuben, a successful American general, happened to be a Prussian, Frederick was taken for a liberator.

The very opposite is true. We can trust Napoleon's professional insight when he declared Frederick a great general, but he was certainly not a liberal, even though he ostentatiously said words of admiration for the French free-thinkers. As a king he was the most inhuman tyrant of his entire epoch, morally far below his rival, the Empress Maria Theresa of Austria. General von Steuben, moreover, had not only been dismissed by his ungrateful king after rendering valuable service, but was virtually exiled. While living in Paris as an immigrant he was discovered by the Count of St. Germaine, who furnished letters of introduction to General Washington. Provided with French money and weapons, General von Steuben sailed for America on a French boat.

The other man who came to America, where he was considered a Prussian, was not a Prussian at all: Carl Schurz. He hailed from a Rhenish family, was born on the shores of the Rhine shortly after Rhineland had been given to Prussia. The Prussians were just as much despised by the Rhinelanders then as they are to-day. As a great American, Schurz went back to Germany as a visitor, to be invited by his former enemy, Chancellor Bismarck, to stay and take German services. Schurz' refusal of this proposition constitutes a great moral victory for America.

Those Germans who came to America as immigrants did not represent the typical German. German Americans born and reared in this country which their fathers have helped to build are looking back to the old country, which they know only by the experience of

an occasional summer trip, with romantic feelings in their hearts. They were full of enthusiasm for the Kaiser, and later for the so-called Führer. Out of their secure haven in America they wanted to see the German world power in a strong hand.

The Story of Frederick as we see him to-day in its true light, and as I wrote about him in the *History of the Germans*, is a typically Prussian story which shows clearly that his philosophy was one of violence and absolutism. In his memoirs he wrote: 'When absolute monarchs take the field, they do as they please; they wage war and let some sedulous jurist worry about justifications.' It sounds like Hitler in *Mein Kampf*.

Frederick quoted Locke, the apostle of liberty; but he gave his citizens less liberty than even the Sun King gave to his, and he did not shrink from having citizens of foreign countries kidnapped and robbed, if this suited him. He was despised by the finest intellects of his time: Lessing, Winckelmann, and Herder. The latter of these is the great German thinker who fled his country cursing it. The King abused Goethe and belittled Shakespeare. The only genius whom Frederick ever met, Bach, was not given what he had hoped to get, namely the position of court organist. To-day, Bach's Brandenburg Concertos are the only things to remind us of the once mighty name of Brandenburg.

* * * * *

Prussia created her own philosophy. In Berlin, Fichte wrote: 'No law and no right exists between states except the right of the stronger,' and Hegel proclaimed: 'War is eternal, and it is moral.' There were and still are other strong nations who more or less believe in this. But to make a religion of it, to have it preached by paid professors, to ask for the blessings of divinities for it, and to employ the teaching of philosophers for a cult of violence: that was Prussia's own invention. Hitler did nothing but follow the old Prussian recipe. The Prussians were the first to proclaim the 'German God,' and they publicly propagandized 'Teutonic World Domination' half a century before Hitler.

While speaking of Prussian intellect it would be interesting to find out how many great minds Prussia contributed to German intellect as a whole. The German Hall of Fame does not contain one single name from Prussia: There were Gutenberg and Kepler; the painters, Dürer, Cranach, Holbein in the sixteenth century. There is Luther. Then comes the brilliant epoch of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing; of some of the world's greatest musicians, Bach, Gluck, Haydn,

Mozart, Schubert, and later Weber, Schumann, Wagner. There are the philosophers Leibniz, Schopenhauer, Hegel. All of these came from the west or south, or they came from Saxony and the Hansa republics. Kant, Beethoven, and Humboldt were half-Germans, Mendelssohn, Marx, Heine, Offenbach, were Jews. None was a real Prussian.

This is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of logic. No German except a Prussian himself would call Prussia a characteristic part of Germany. But all agree that the soul of the nation tends, and is bound to, the Rhine, where history and legend, poetry, wine and music have created the innermost essence of German life. It was not for the eastern provinces of Silesia and Posen that Germans from every part of Germany gave their lives. It was only for the Rhine and the old and venerable cities of the west.

And yet, Prussia definitely ruled Germany. German liberals had tried for half a century to unite the Germans at the time when the Italians, the Greeks and other nations united. Full of good will, their heads crammed with beautiful ideas, these professors and writers lacked any government experience. How could these ideologies succeed against the doctrine of steel that Prussian militarism had built up for centuries and was now holding against them? No group of German commoners had ever sat down to discuss the future of their country. When it finally happened, it was in the form of a pre-parliament convened in Frankfurt without elections. And whom did these men choose as a kind of president? An insignificant Archduke of Hapsburg.

When it was proposed to the King of Prussia that he become Emperor of Germany, he gave this significant reason for declining the honour: "I will not accept a crown lifted from out the dust of the people; a crown must come from God."

When in Berlin and Vienna the masses arose in 1848 for the first time after four hundred years, they were trying to get by force what had been promised them by their monarchs forty years before: influence in the government and the right to vote. Prussian bayonets quickly suppressed the so-called revolution in Berlin and the South. The results were even more reactionary measures everywhere.

When twenty years later Junker Bismarck succeeded in uniting the Germans by force without asking their permission, his methods, of course, were Prussian. But his point of view was wider and greater than that of any Prussian before him or since.

The son of an obscure Prussian Junker family, Bismarck had

inherited his brain from his mother, whose ancestors were commoners known as excellent jurists and legislators. In spite of his talents, Bismarck would never have been able to penetrate the confidence of his reactionary king—and through it gain unlimited power—had he not possessed the title of Baron and the giant physique of a Junker. In many respects, Bismarck was not at all a typical product of Prussia. He proved that by the choice of his friends. The two women who attracted him most were a Russian princess and an English girl, and the only two close friends he ever had from his youth to his death, were a Baltic count and the well-known American historian Motley, the man to whom Bismarck addressed the most intimate letters of his life.

It is ridiculous to compare Hitler with Bismarck, as is so often done these days. In every respect these two show the greatest contrasts, just as their favourite composers, Beethoven and Wagner, do. It is not an accident that Beethoven's Fifth Symphony was played in Bismarck's house just before he embarked on his great coup against Austria. Hitler, the histrionic and hysterical orator is, of course, a typical Wagnerite. His goal lies somewhere beyond a mystic and unlimited desire to conquer the world, a dream like those the medieval kaisers dreamed.

Bismarck had a crystal-clear vision of what he wanted to do: to unite the Germans, make them strong, but not primarily to increase their territory. It was, as we have said, in a Prussian way, by force and violence, that he conquered the various German states. But in no country is unity attained entirely without force; and Bismarck was one of the few statesmen who knew how to use their brakes after having defeated the opposition, which in Bismarck's case was Austria. With the utmost perseverance, and even through personal threats, he prevented his victorious generals from marching into Austria and entering Vienna as victors. The treaty which he signed with Austria in 1866 can rightly be called the first 'Wilson peace' in modern history: it did not ask for territory or for reparations.

When later in 1871 he had to give in to the will of his victorious king and take Alsace from France, the peace conditions which he dictated to the French cannot be compared with anything that Hitler has been dictating.

In 1885, Bismarck inaugurated the first social security, fifty years before Franklin Roosevelt. Of course, this was done by order, just as the unification of the Reich was done by order and the revival of the imperial Germany was done by order. But when Bismarck

proclaimed the foundation of the German Reich at Versailles in 1871 and made a kaiser out of King William, a deputation of German commoners and civilians had been invited, not to hold council, but at least to witness what had been decided before by the princes. The king himself had to be forced to take the imperial crown.

A few years before this, in 1867, the Germans clearly demonstrated their incapacity for self-government. They had finally obtained the right to vote for a parliament destined to draft a constitution for a coming union of the Reich. When it came to the point where the vote should decide whether or not their parliament would have the right to give or deny a vote of confidence to every cabinet, a majority of eighty per cent voted against it, that is, against their own right. This shows a remarkable fear of responsibility and lack of self-assurance.

In a big square in Berlin stands the palace of the Reichstag, and in front of it the enormous statue of Bismarck, founder of the Reich, in the uniform of a general, his feet in high boots and a big sword dangling from his side, both of which he hated to wear.

But a little beyond, almost within its shadow, stands a smaller building, the true heart of Prussia: the General Staff. People pass by it with shy looks, speaking in a lower tone of voice, always in fear of what the secrets might be in this mysterious house. Out of it came once in every generation the fateful sheet of paper signed by the kings or kaisers, and now the Führer, and published without asking permission of those in the big Reichstag in front: the mobilization order. And the people loved these orders and always accepted them.

In Bismarck's hands it was all safe: for twenty years he carefully avoided involvement in a new war. He knew only too well the geographically dangerous position of Germany, between three, and even four, powerful neighbours. For many years he opposed the building of a large navy. Bismarck was the last dam across Germany's growing imperialism. He was content with having made a Prussian king the hereditary president of the German Reich, which was all that he intended the German kaiser to be.

But lest my words should be misconstrued, let me make it quite clear that though it is foolish to compare Hitler with Bismarck, nevertheless the latter showed an utter ruthlessness and complete lack of scruple in the policy he followed.

Bismarck was first opposed to a German acquisition of colonies, at a time when England was acquiring more and more of them. This resignation in such a proud man can only have been brought about by a deep knowledge of the German character. He knew that only citizens

of a free country were fit to be 'merchant adventurers'. With all their efficiency and organization, the Germans were not successful in their colonization; they tried to bring their system of the pyramid down to the equator. I visited those colonies in 1912. In Africa just as in Berlin, the subject was to serve the state, not vice versa. An unfree people, the Germans were not fit to govern unfree natives.

It was not until after his dismissal—and then immediately after it—that the arrogant, threatening tone of world domination was heard in the Germany of William II, a typical decadent heir. His physical weakness, a crippled arm, and a misguided education made him endeavour to hide his defect, and to play the strong man.

It is significant that in the course of one generation the German people twice idolized a hysterical leader. The similarity between William II and Hitler is so astonishing that in the beginning of his career Adolf was often called William III.

There is something uncanny in this preference for over-emotional, histrionic leaders. Sound characters, individuals as well as nations, look for healthy, well-balanced leaders and find them. In 160 years the Americans have not had one single hysterical President. Nor does history tell of an English prime minister who was insane. Both William II and Hitler are abnormal, a fact which has been proven more by their general behaviour than by uncontrollable reports of homosexuality.

During all of his twenty-eight years of government, Bismarck, a typical he-man, was hated and feared by all classes; only after his dismissal and perhaps because of it, the Germans began to make much of their grand old man. But it was under William II that General Bernhardi and others began to publish their exciting Nazi-style books about world domination. Here is an example of what the Prussian general Bernhardi wrote about the American President Taft:

'In the United States, President Taft had actually proposed arbitration treaties between the powers. Such efforts must be discouraged and discredited. War must be given back its moral justification in public opinion. The great significance of war as the most powerful promoter of culture must become generally acknowledged in accordance with its value. . . . War at once brings into play the loftiest activities of human nature. Individual crudities and frailties disappear before the idealism of the whole. . . . General treaties of arbitration are bound to be particularly pernicious for a rising nation which, like

the Germans, has not yet attained its political and national apex and is thus dependent on the expansion of its power.'

It was William II who sabotaged the peace resolution of The Hague and wrote the untranslatable marginal: 'Ich scheisse auf die ganzed Beschlüsse !'

For Bismarck there existed two intellectual antipodes: Wagner, disliked by the Beethoven-admirer, Bismarck, but whose spirit had won more power over the Germans fifty years later, under Hitler, than had Bismarck's legacy; and Nietzsche, who is not at all responsible for the Nazi theories of to-day. He was anti-democratic, that is true, and he invented the word 'Herrenmoral,' which he applied to extremely gifted individuals but did not mean for the bulk of the German people. Nietzsche outdid even Goethe in his bitterness against the Germans as a nation. "When I imagine the kind of man," he writes, "that runs counter to all my instincts, it always turns out to be a German. I cannot abide this race with whom one is always in bad company, that has no sense for nuance. . . . I fear the black continent where the slaves are to be liberated in the vicinity of the north Germans. . . . Definition of the Teuton: obedience and long legs . . . The Germans are a dangerous people—they understand the art of intoxication. . . . All true Teutons went abroad. The present Germany is in a pre-Slavic stage and is preparing the way for a Pan-Slavic Europe."

* * * * *

Under the reign of Bismarck, when Germany for a short time was not engaged in preparing for or waging war, German talent turned to industry and the three hundred years of military training were turned to peace activities. The spirit of Prussia's militarism permeated her factories, hospitals, shipyards; the drilling of soldiers begun by the Great Elector and continued by Frederick the Great's father was now continued in the factories of Zeiss, Krupp and Thyssen.

The world at large perhaps still does not understand that twice in recent times, in 1910 and 1930, the Germans have had the chance to become the leaders of Europe's industry and commerce. Their tempo and industriousness, their modesty as far as good living is concerned, their inborn unrest and zealous efforts, offered them better chances than the French and English had.

This would have been a peaceful life, but the old magic of the word 'conquest' would not permit it to continue, and the peaceful endeavour was turned into world wars. The two men who started these

wars, William as well as Adolf, are to blame for the fact that Germany in our century lost the opportunity of enriching the world by her peace-time achievements. One cannot imagine that an American president would have stood up in Washington in 1900 or in 1920 and proclaimed to the world: "We are now the richest and the strongest; let us declare war and conquer Canada or Mexico." In America public opinion would have said 'No' most emphatically to such a proposal. The German tradition says 'Yes.'

From the very beginning it was not at all certain that the Allies would win the last World War, much less certain than it is to-day. There are, however, four particular reasons for the German defeat of 1918.

In the past the one virtue which the Prussian ruling caste could claim for themselves was the fact that they were incorruptible. At the time of my childhood in Germany the professor, the general were beyond suspicion: they were not even interested in money. It was honour they were after. The generals, the state ministers were poor. Lesser side branches of aristocratic families had to economize. Their daughters often had to sew their own dresses for the court ball, because the son, serving in an elite regiment, had to have all of the family income.

This Prussian simplicity ended with William I who slept in an iron field bed all his life and died at the age of ninety. William II, his successor, immediately had his revenue nearly doubled and gave himself to all sorts of luxury, developing the very same poor taste that Hitler developed after him. With the court living extravagantly, small wonder that every Junker in Prussia tried to imitate it. And so it came to be that the counts began to marry their sons to daughters of rich, untitled citizens, to bankers and industrialists, even to Jewish ones, in order to secure money for their families. This was done to the great satisfaction of cartoonists, who made these liaisons their special target.

The social structure of America would not be endangered if a New York banker would marry his daughter to a prince without land. Money of course, is certain to hold its own. But in Prussia the whole pyramid of an incorruptible privileged class of officers and government officials shook on its foundations when the desire for money and for positions began to favour these new unions of the aristocracy with industry and finance.

When the First World War broke out, the morals of the Prussian officer had changed considerably since the time of his last war, forty years before. Though there was a considerable amount of looting

and vandalism in the Franco-Prussian War, in 1914 and 1918 the corruption was almost as general as it is in Germany to-day. I have seen with my own eyes high Prussian officers bringing back furs and silver stolen from rich houses in Rumania. The imperial Turks, never great examples of honesty, simply stood aside in despair when Oriental antiques disappeared in the vans of the Balkan express headed for Germany.

The growing wealth of the governing circle did in no way diminish its contempt for culture: the desire for more riches naturally encouraged the desire for wars of conquest. The German contempt for pacifists developed the belief that anyone advocating peace was a cad, a traitor to his own country.

Another reason for the defeat in 1918 was the personal cowardice of the Kaiser. His grandfather, William I, nearly had to be forced by Bismarck to leave dangerous spots during battles. The Kaiser's unsoldierly behaviour during the four years of war seriously threatened the sympathy for monarchy in his country. The very same man who had threatened the world in his boastful speeches for twenty years showed himself as a timid background-hero who would never go near the fighting front.

After the defeat the Junkers blamed the lessening of public morale upon the newly created republic. The truth is not that the socialists had undermined the spirit of soldierly Prussia and the traditional respect of Germans for their king, but that the unseemly behaviour of the 'war lords' from the Kaiser downwards had begun the decomposition of the Prusso-Spartan spirit.

A third reason for the Germans' defeat is to be found in the poor diplomacy which Germany had produced, the diplomats coming from the uncultured ruling class which never admitted a man of brains to a high position. They had and gave the people the most ludicrous ideas about America and her will to fight. I saw them laughing aloud when an old Junker got up in the Reichstag and cried out: "How could the Americans come over here? They have no ships, and they cannot swim!"

The whole nation believed such stupid remarks. At least half of the German people, even to-day when they should know better, believe Goebbels when he broadcasts to the masses, "The invasion is postponed because the British and Americans are still at breakfast."

When Lloyd George spoke of the 'silver bullets' of the Allies, it made the Germans feel like pious crusaders fighting a holy war against infidels. The German soldiers marched to the front in the belief that they were fighting for an eternal idea.

Finally, it was the complete failure of the intelligentsia which lost the war for Germany. An internationally-minded intellectual front might have been able to find a common platform to create understanding with the best French and English brains in 1917. Such a front could have considerably strengthened the few socialist leaders who went abroad in search for a way of approach to the Allies. But the German professors followed their sacred tradition and praised everything that the generals deemed praiseworthy. Old Prince Bülow told me later that in spite of his being chancellor, he had not been informed that the invasion of Belgium had been ordered by the General Staff. The generals governed alone, absolutely, undisturbed until defeat. When Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg declared: "Need knows no heed," the whole nation, including the philosophers, gave him applause. Ninety-three of the foremost German intellectuals published a manifesto that solemnly declared that the violation of Belgium's neutrality was moral, just, and marvellous. With the exception of a handful of independent intellectuals—Rathenau refused to sign, but he saved his country in the first years—the German professors, poets, and artists backed the Belgium violation by the generals one hundred per cent. Why?

As we have said before, every scientist, doctor, writer or whatever he might have been and whatever profession he might have followed, felt greatly honoured if permitted to wear a uniform. Bruening, who governed Germany for two years, confessed to me much later that the happiest, the greatest time of his life was the two or three years he spent as a private and later a lieutenant in the war.

The Jews in Prussia were especially war-enthusiastic and tried to outdo the Gentiles in Prussianism. Even to-day many of them are defending the 'poor misled German nation' and dream of their returning home. The Jews would never return to Germany except if invited to come back through a national plebiscite. They have not too little, but too much patriotism to suit the man who led their country. Out of a hundred Jews, nearly as many were killed in action as out of a hundred 'Aryans'. Later Goebbel had the names of the Jews chiselled out of the marble slabs of the local war monuments: perhaps the most despicable of all his actions. When all the Junkers in their splendid uniforms were running and hiding from the fleeing German army in 1918, one prominent Jew, Albert Ballin, creator of the Hapag Steamship Line, Germany's pride, killed himself on the very day that the Kaiser deserted his colours and fled the country. He could not bear the thought of living in what he considered shame. The Kaiser lived on for twenty years, in good health and plenty.

When the Americans arrived to decide and end the war in 1918, they were regarded as rather unexpected participants in the conquest. But when two or three years later they came to Germany in order to loan money and transact business, any admiration for them disappeared at once. The Germans cannot understand that a victor should be inclined to reconciliation out of his own free will. Help was given to the Germans in good faith, but they took it as a sign of growing weakness, as an inclination to fear. Since that time, the Americans have been mistrusted in Germany, and the idea they could be received as saviours as they were in Italy, is completely erroneous.

The Americans this time will certainly repeat their performance of courage, but they should not repeat their friendly attitude after victory. Only then will they be acknowledged as victors. Fear is what the Germans must feel; otherwise, he will immediately become overbearing and aggressive.

III

THE GERMAN DEFEATED

"Plague on this people ! Barely free again,
What does it do but rend itself in twain ?
Have you learnt nothing from the grief, the joy ?
Oh, German, Low or High, you ain't a clever boy."
—*Goethe*.

THE GENERAL BELIEF IN THE ANGLO-SAXON COUNTRIES SEEMS TO BE that the treaty of Versailles was a 'slave treaty' and that it created Hitler. It is the thorough German propaganda that has spread this belief. In reality, the terms of the Versailles treaty were a most agreeable surprise for the beaten Germans, and it is far-fetched to connect this with the creation of the Hitler movement. The three principal conditions of the treaty were already cancelled before Hitler came to power. If, by chance, there had not been a humanist and philanthropist like Woodrow Wilson at the helm of the American Government, if another type of man had represented and acted for the United States at Versailles, the Germans would certainly not have been permitted to keep the Rhine, and peace terms would have been established along the lines proposed by Clemenceau. This might, perhaps, have proven the better solution.

Germany pretended it was because of Wilson's Fourteen Points that she asked for an armistice in 1918. In reality, the armistice was asked for because after four years of war the Germans were terribly beaten. It was not a people's revolution in Germany that brought about the end of the war, but a revolution concocted by German generals one month before German sailors struck in Kiel. General Ludendorff, supported by Hindenburg like a gambler, declared, "My game is up; I cannot continue; I must have an armistice within twenty-four hours."

It might be of interest to know that the breakdown of German nerves occurred so suddenly and so completely that the Germans gave up while their armies were still deep in the territory of their enemies. Together with their allies they held nearly as much territory then as they are holding to-day, and yet within twenty-four hours the German High Command collapsed so completely that not even an attempt was made to shift some of the German forces back to Germany before asking for terms. The German generals lacked the courage to go back to Germany proper. In the first weeks, hundreds of Prussian officers allowed their imperial emblems to be torn off their caps and uniforms. I saw this being done in Berlin street-cars several times.

The treaty of Versailles, it is true, is responsible for some ethnic errors. It was also a mistake not to fix the amount of Germany's reparations. At the suggestion of the Americans the treaty provided for plebiscites, which was an entirely new feature. However, the Germans are the only nation which made money out of the First World War. They paid 4.4 billion of dollars in reparations, but actually during this period they received 6.4 billions of dollars as loans, of which not one cent was ever paid back.

The question of the Polish Corridor did not excite the Germans. Being born near Germany's Polish frontier, I know how little popular that region of the Reich was with the Germans; it was almost unknown. The German revengists, however, spread a slogan all over the world, namely that the Versailles treaty cut Germany into two pieces by creating the Polish Corridor. This corridor would not have done harm any more than British Columbia, which is a hundred times larger and separates Alaska from Washington State. But the creation of the Corridor was an impediment to the Junkers, who had enormous estates in that area; and so they incited a great fuss about it.

The real and fundamental mistake at Versailles was the complete misjudgment of German psychology. The Allies believed that without previous education and without a tradition, the Germans could over-

night become liberal and form a democratic state. The Allies left complete and unrestrained freedom to the Germans, even though they took a few slices of territory from them. And later they relaxed the provisions of the treaty by modifying it every five years. Even the great Briand, idealistic though he was, failed to understand German mentality. When he agreed to freeing the Rhineland five years before the treaty provided for it, a so-called German liberal said to me, "Now you see, they are nothing but cowards, the French." No German can understand why someone should want to make a 'gentleman's agreement'.

It is not surprising that the Allies mistook the German character in 1919. Many of those who claimed knowledge of Germany made the same mistake themselves. We who wrote books which helped mould popular opinion, we, too, made a mistake. We thought that now the other Germany, the Germany of the thinkers and liberals, would come into power. It was a bad omen for the Republic that the Germans did not have to fight for it but should receive it passively. In the first moment, fear reigned supreme; then, a few poor, inexperienced liberals and socialists, prompted by the cowardice of the Junkers, took over the ship of state. There was no leadership, no enthusiasm, because there was nobody to bark out orders. In such a way, all that the Germans did was to feel sorry for themselves. Hitler was quite right when he declared that the German people were not fit for democracy. How could they be? For three hundred years they had been taught to take orders from military bosses.

The Weimar Republic in Germany was based upon the principles of freedom and humanity, and the Germans found that exceedingly dull. They had never exercised responsibility and, therefore, were afraid of it. Their new liberty troubled them. They did not understand the meaning of universal equality. They disliked and boycotted the Weimar constitution at once. The first political murders in Germany, which followed the World War, were committed ten years before the Nazi party came to power. The great Rathenau and another Reichsminister, Erzberger, as well as three others, were murdered between 1920 and 1922, right at the beginning of the Republic. These murders were symbolic of the dislike for the Republic by the overwhelming majority of the people. General sympathy was with the murderers. Highly cultured and well-educated people, professors, and even whole universities, joined in to the hymns of hate and revenge. Liberals of long standing turned nationalists in the most reactionary fashion. This, however, is a phenomenon to be observed in almost every country; after a defeat the opposition turns nationalistic. When

I wrote that Germany was partly responsible for the war, three 'liberal' professors wrote articles against me as a 'bird who soils his own nest.'

The new Republic was so unpopular in Germany, so weak and incapable of ruling, that ten years after its foundation, its flag had to be covered with linen when brought to a convention or when carried in a parade, because of the danger of insults from the crowd. The very word 'Republic' was so much disliked that the Germans replaced it with the word 'Reich,' and 'Reich' it is to-day.

Since no enemy soldier ever entered Germany during the last war, with the possible exception of the first weeks in a far corner of the Reich, the people fostered the idea that Germany was never beaten. "We were not defeated in the war," they said. "We were betrayed from within. Socialists and Jews stabbed us in the back."

Books regarding 'The Unbeaten Army' were sold by the hundred thousands, whilst books of liberal authors had to go abroad to find success. The timidity of the new leaders of the Republic, some of whom were outright traitors, did not increase the prestige of the Republic. It was a burlesque to see the two generals responsible for the German debacle, appearing at a hearing of the Reichstag, receive flowers from the Reichstag leaders, who thus expressed the popular feeling: 'We love you.'

The labour leaders, instead of revolting and putting Junkers and Counts into jail, fought against their own more radical brothers. After having worked for the International of all workers, they turned against it. On the second day of the 'revolution' the labour leader Ebert united with Marshal von Hindenburg to suppress any revolutionary movement, as General Groener, Hindenburg's aide de camp, stated. The vacuum in November 1918 lasted ten hours; then the victorious labour party surrendered to the stripes of the defeated generals.

Many of the old reactionary officers, especially those belonging to the nobility, were left in their positions by the Republic; and thus the new liberal leaders were, of course, only nominally in control.

The only group within Germany which was still able to arouse patriotic enthusiasm was the Reichswehr, the new German army. The Reichswehr, of course, was led by old-time Junkers, as the army always had been. The 100,000 soldiers which the Versailles treaty permitted Germany to have, multiplied into a million. Officially they did not belong to the Reichswehr, and they were not called army; but they were there. Unlike the scions of the royal house of France, banned from their homeland for a century, the German Crown prince was

permitted to come back soon after his flight to Holland, because the Republic was so palpably weak that no liberal in Germany would have dared to turn against a prince.

Then came the first election. And what did the Germans, intelligent people that they undoubtedly are, do? For the first time in a thousand years they were electing their own leaders. Whom did they choose? Half a dozen men of high standing and experience, endowed with the qualities of leadership, were there to be chosen from. But instead, nearly eighty-year-old Field Marshal Hindenburg was elected, whose qualifications for office was that he had surrendered the country previously, refusing a negotiated peace—just as one of his ancestors had surrendered a Prussian fortress in 1806, for which deed he was sentenced to death. (These two surrenders were all the Hindenburg family could boast of.) Nevertheless, prominent Americans said, "Hindenburg is the pride of the Fatherland. We believe he is the best man to head their government." Only yesterday the very same things were said with regard to Pétain.

When the old marshal, become president of a democratic Republic, declared that he was a monarchist, he really made a hit with the German people. "He is our father," they cried out. "He is our new king." He was a marvellous man with a big moustache and very wide red stripes on his trousers.

This old man, first president ever to be elected by the German people, soon declared that the Kaiser was entitled to be repaid his millions. He was also the inventor of the monstrous lie that the war was not lost by him but through a stab in the back. The liberals, and even some of the socialists, were so bent on revenge, and therefore for building up military power, that a socialist chancellor signed the bill permitting the building of a new battleship, although during the fifty years previous to the war the socialists had been opposed to naval expansion. They were delighted to be allowed to work with real counts.

It was not at Versailles, but in Berlin, that the Wiemar Republic was lost; not through the violence of a dictator but in the soul of the German people, who had not learned the meaning of the word democracy. Such a situation constitutes an ideal field of operation for a resolute adventurer.

* * * * *

German propaganda succeeded in making the Americans believe that the treaty of Versailles destroyed the economic power of Germany.

During the last years, eminent American economists proved that the contrary is true. In 1923-28 the German production, especially that of steel, increased more than that of any other country. Nearly all German factories worked. Everywhere there was production and use of luxuries. Books appeared in Germany that were of a print as marvellous as ever before.

The inflation was a fraudulent trick, invented by some industrialists to get loans by the millions from the Berlin treasury, then to change them into foreign money, and to return them at last, some months later, in the form of devaluated bank bills. Hugo Stinnes, greatest gangster of German industry, made use of this manœuvre to make the greatest fortune that ever existed in Germany. Even in the very last hour of his life he cheated his country by 'donating' his many millions to his wife, so as to evade the inheritance taxes. Until 1929 German economy flourished partly by American and other loans, partly by the fraudulent Germans' resistance to pay the reparations. From small Switzerland alone they received two billions which they never gave back. With foreign loans they sabotaged the Republic, then they financed Hitler, then they made new millions out of the armaments for the present war—and now they try to contact the Allies for appeasement.

Some people in America say that unemployment was responsible for Hitler. Did America not have the same unemployment problem? The Germans enjoyed prosperity just as the Americans did: from 1925 to 1928. The same period of unemployment existed here as it did in Germany from 1929 to 1933. America had ten millions out of work; Germany, five. If unemployment was the reason for Hitler's rise to power, why did not America go fascist as did Germany?

Because uniforms in America are the exception; but in Germany they are the great ideal, and have been for centuries. What a happy day for the Germans when finally there came a Hitler who brought back to them brass music, uniforms, goose steps, decorations and a boss whose very voice sounded like a command! That was what they wanted. Here was a man who even gave them riding boots, although they had no horses to ride. When one asked a bank clerk why he and all the other clerks were wearing riding boots at the office, he replied, "My Führer is in Nuremberg to-day." That is their mentality. It is not something which can be rubbed out. Hitler gave them a new vision of world domination, revising an old mystic slogan, which has prevailed throughout the medieval period of German history and so easily finds an echo in the German mentality. The Germans understand a ruler who uses such a philosophy. They like

to have their cannon made of ninety-five per cent steel, copper and nickel, and five per cent philosophy. They listen to the music of world domination: Wagner's music. On 1st May, 1933, Hitler shouted to 100,000 persons in Tempelhof, asking for 'Gehorsam' (obedience). Three times he shouted 'Gehorsam,' and the world could hear over the air the thundering applause that greeted him. From this moment onward, the Germans began to love their Führer. They welcomed him with cheers. The socialists had failed to fight for the Republic; their leaders were honest, but small men. Not one capable statesman resulted from the German socialist party.

When the Kaiser and the princes fled Germany, two imperial officers—their names are König and Zimmer—fought and died to protect the imperial flag. Yet not one single German working-man died for the Republic in 1932 when von Papen dissolved the government of Prussia. Again their love of submission to authority proved greater than their love of liberty. The German likes to die for the Fatherland, but not to think for it. It is quite easy for him to obey someone else; it is almost impossible for him to stand up as an individual, or to act on his own initiative. A man with a voice like a certain American president, whose modulated speech over the air appeals to people, would not be possible in Germany. Germans don't like persuasion. They love a man who barks. Of him they say, "That must be a strong man." I have seen in my youth intelligent and even liberal scientists thrilled by listening to the Kaiser, who spoke in a shouting, disagreeable sergeant's voice.

Hitler is morally as well as legally the true representative of the German nation. He was elected in the most democratic way. No United States President ever took possession of the White House with more right than Hitler when he took possession of the Reichskanzlei in Berlin in 1933. In the last two free elections in Germany of 1932, when the secret ballot was still used, the German people by its own free will voted the Nazis the strongest party. Hitler was elected chief of this strongest party, and just as King George of England nominated Mr. Churchill to head the British cabinet, so President Hindenburg of Germany named Adolf Hitler chancellor. Hitler was the choice of the people. No candidate had ever publicized his programme quite so openly. Every German was well acquainted with Hitler's methods and aims. This book outlined the Führer's idea of world domination, of the Great War to be fought, the persecution of the Jews, the distinctions to be made between two classes of citizens. With the exception of some millions the German nation was delighted; they had found a new boss.

Here, as everywhere else, the nomination was the deciding step—the Rubicon—and it was absolutely legal. Only after he had taken office did he embark upon his criminal breaking of the constitution and the violation of all existing laws and regulations.

Hitler has the distinction of being the only modern tyrant to whom the government was handed over in a most democratic fashion; all other modern dictators attained their power by force: Napoleon I, in 1799; Napoleon III, in 1851, Lenin in 1917; Mussolini, 1922. All of these broke their adversaries by force or threat. The French, Russian and Italian peoples were overrun and therefore could disclaim responsibility. It is only the German people that elected its dictator. Therefore, they are, as a whole, responsible. Not only did they elect a dictator: they kept him in power for a decade.

Where, in those days of 1933, was the Germany of Goethe? Our books were burned publicly in May. Not only the S.S. men (Storm Troopers), but also thousands of university students who only recently had read these books eagerly, now were happily shouting around the big bonfires, and delightedly throwing book after book into the flames.

Certainly, there were exceptions even among Germans, such as Pastor Niemoller (the ardent anti-Nazi, later imprisoned by Hitler). But even a man like him, speaking to an American just before his arrest, said, "If there should be war against France, I would go at once."

The acts of barbarism committed by the Nazis were not approved by the whole people. There were some millions who were opposed to such actions. But they remained silent. Who really arose against Hitlerism? It was a few pastors and working-men that protested. The Jews were not merely assailed by the Nazis; the great majority of the German people applauded. I will publish hundreds of eye-witness reports describing how German citizens, men and women, without any urging or official order but by their own free will, helped Storm Troopers in hunting down, whipping and killing Jews. A small minority remained passive, some helped the victims. Documents proving these facts speak for all parts of Germany and Austria, and cover the pogroms from 1933 to 1938.

The Germans could easily prove that they were not responsible for William II. It is quite true that they 'inherited' this man. Later, when the Republic failed, they could say, "We were not educated and did not know how to govern." But they have no excuse for Hitler, whom they elected.



The old Puritan spirit in America, with its traditional sympathy for the weak, now tries to excuse Germany. Americans like to think that the brutalities committed in Germany were perpetrated by the Nazis only; that the German people are not to blame.

Germany has about one million Nazi soldiers, but she commands an army of fifteen millions. Everyone has seen some of these fifteen million Germans in photographs or movies, and there are thousands of reports about their brutalities. Who were those pilots that dive-bombed in France and machine-gunned fleeing women and children? Who was it that torpedoed hospital ships? Who bombed the little town of Bath in England, knowing very well that three hundred children were the target? Who wiped out the village of Lidice in Czechoslovakia? Who gassed thousands of Jews in closed wagons and shot other thousands?

There is a photo that was published by the *Berliner Illustrirte*; it shows a cart drawn by eight Polish Jews. Standing inside the cart one can see some German soldiers, laughing and mocking and having a good time in being pulled by this strange team. These unknown soldiers are from the German people; they are not the Nazis. In all cruelties it is the average German soldier who acts. He represents a cross-section of his people, just as an average American soldier represents a cross-section of the American people.

It is, however, interesting to note that it is not perversity that animates these Germans. An individual might be 'sadistic,' like Hitler or Hangman Heydrich, but no nation is sadistic. These men are moved by a perverted idealism: the religion of violence. They have been educated for this by German writers, even before Hegel's time, for a hundred years. The Nazi attorney-general expressed this creed when he said, "Right is what is good for Germany." Other nations have been cruel in their wars, we know, but they did not make a religion of barbarity; "Right or wrong: my country" is a defence, not a slogan for world aggression. The English never proclaimed: "We are the masters of the world and right is what gives us advantage."

"The Germans are in love with death," said Clemenceau. They indeed love tragedy. Here lies the main difference between them and the Americans.

The Germans know what they are doing. Since they are responsible as a nation, they must be punished as a nation.

To-day America—not England—is in danger of falling into the German trap; Wilson was caught by it in 1918, when he tried to separate the German people and their Kaiser. Wilson said that the Kaiser and the leading class had ordered the Germans to fight the

war and that they were alone responsible—not the people. Once again, to-day, a people that twice in one generation has wrecked the peace of the world tends to be acquitted because there is an undue feeling of sympathy towards it.

Who feels sorry for the Germans to-day should be a follower of Ghandi's passivity. But who has taken up arms, who is sacrificing the lives of young men to fight against the German warrior nation, should not weaken before the idea of making use of victory to prevent in a relentless way a third German aggression. You are not a barbarian if you arrest a rowdy, but you are decidedly stupid if you embrace him as a brother.

The rules of 'fair play' are solid as long as both parties stick to it. But the unparalleled deceit that the German nation enthusiastically showed forth when their leaders broke the treaties of 1919, when they trampled down every rule of war and every law of humanity—this whole German religion of violence, preached and practised for a hundred years, must definitely be expiated. It can be done by the hard resolution of men who, having fought as a people against another people, will make their opponents responsible for its acts and convictions.

And those of you who care to practise Christian charity, should they not bestow it first of all on the 200 million Europeans from the subjugated nations instead of to their executioners?

Adolf Hitler will be assassinated by his own men—by the Junkers probably, although they will say it was a Jew. When a conqueror ceases to win great victories, people leave him at once. "A legal king can lose one battle after another," said Napoleon, "but I am a conqueror; I cannot afford to lose even one." When he did lose one he lost everything.

The world will never be given the sight of the prisoner Hitler in the defendant's box; not because he will be killed by the enemy in action or by himself, but by his desperate followers.

In England, France, and other countries, kings have been tried and executed by their subjects. But there was never, and there never will be a German court to condemn a defeated ruler.

If Hitler should live and be left in German hands and before a German court, they would murder the revolutionary judges who would dare to accuse him. They would welcome the accused with flowers just as they did it for Hindenburg on that December day 1919 at his hearing in the Congress Committee, or as they did it for the run-away Kaiser, taking care to send him his millions of cash and then to have flowers showered on the poor master on his birthday.

in his beautiful house in Holland. They would give Hitler a pension and a villa in the Berliner Grunewald. After a year they would begin to make pilgrimages to his house, and adulate his seducing photo on the wall. First they would whisper, and gradually, in the course of time, print with big letters: 'Our Great Leader—in the moment of final victory he was stabbed in the back by the Communists, who were paid by the Russians, and by the French prisoners, working in our factories, who were paid by the American plutocrats !'

For centuries the Germans have defended their authorities even if they were wrong, and worshipped the Divine State even if it was defeated. They hate to accuse a ruler, because their philosophy would be shaken were a leader wrong. For this reason no revolution has ever succeeded in Germany, and for the same reason no change took place in the minds of the beaten Germans in 1919 or will take place in 1944. The inborn uncertainty, which in our First Chapter we called a fundamental part of the German character, forbids the German to confess an error of choice.

It might be that the breakdown of German nerves will occur simultaneously with the death or flight of Hitler. After all, they have been engaged in war work consistently during the last eleven years, not only four years like in the last war. There is the question of fatigue and then, too, the fact that now they are not defending a dynasty which was one of the motives to drive them on until 1918. The Prussian dynasty had existed for four hundred years.

The greatest single element which will force the breakdown is the air bombardment which, to me, is a vertical second front, from above. Those who try to draw an analogy between the Germans and the British are mistaken. The English and the German characters are different. The English are stubborn. An Englishman attacked, bombarded from the air, stiffens, grits his teeth, and says to himself, "I am not going to run away; I will stick here if it lasts ten years." This attitude is strengthened by his highly developed sense of responsibility and also of manners. He has been educated like that.

In Germany there was never anything like fair play. The German memoirs of Prince Bülow gave surprising examples of this fact, as well as the writings of the German Count Kessler. Discipline and obedience, these are German characteristics; but the Germans lack the disposition to deal generously or even fairly with an opponent. Consequently, every German feels that, should he be overcome, the opponent will not be fair to him. Bismarck, who knew his German, said, "The German has no civil courage." He is an excellent soldier; but when you find him without a uniform, with no boss, no colonel

to direct him, and he stands in Cologne or Essen where bombardments hammer at him, you see him lose his nerve.

Another reason for an early collapse of Germany is Hitler's abdication as supreme military commander. The relinquishing of his 'command by intuition' is for the Germans equivalent to a lost battle, worse than Stalingrad and Tunis. For ten long years seventy millions have believed in the magic of the Führer; and had it been only five years and only forty millions, still until his military abdication he represented the last anchor of hope. And now, his armies beaten on every battlefield, defeat looming at the horizon, at the supreme moment when the leader should lead, he gives up the command.

The only thing that keeps the German people united, this fall of 1943, is the feeling which Goebbels has been injecting into them for more than a year; that they would be sold as slaves or sterilized. To counteract this propaganda a manifesto should be brought before the eyes and to the ears of the Germans, as suggested by the author*, containing nothing but the Allies' true intentions, that are: to occupy and govern Germany but not to resort to physical punishment of the nation.

What will happen on the day after the downfall or death of Hitler ? The Junkers and generals will immediately bow and say : "We love the Americans. We do not hate the Jews. We do not ask for colonies. Come, let us be brothers again."

After Hitler's exit the Junkers will concede anything. They might even present to the Allies the martyr Niemoeller, in order to show their disgust with Nazism. In spite of the fact that they alone make the war possible, they will do everything to avoid being held responsible, just as their fathers and cousins did; and they will once more send some German liberals to sign the armistice, as in the fall of 1918. Groups within the Allied Nations might be inclined to say, "Now let us make peace, let's finish up this business; they are good people after all, these generals."

They are not. They are not one bit better than the Hitlers. They do have better manners. They are just as guilty as the Nazis themselves. Without the General Staff, Hitler could not have gone to war. Because he gave them back their positions as war lords, gave them power and money, and helped them realize their dream of revenge, they accepted this little Austrian proletarian, whom they despise, because of his popular 'sex appeal'. This time, the Nazis and Junkers will

*This manifesto is printed at the end of this book.

have to sign the armistice. The generals, standard bearers of the German war-will, must be destroyed. As long as they exist, every German boy will dream of revenge. The unconditional surrender must subject all German forces, not only the military ones, but also the civilian ones. It was not merely the spirit of the soldiers, it was that of a whole nation that supported a war four years without revolting against it in the least.

With victory attained, the Allies will have to decide definitely what to do with the German nation. Two plans are suggested in America. I don't think that either of them is acceptable. One would send all Germans to the upper Nile or sterilize their men, destroy their factories, and force them to raise potatoes in Germany. I was surprised to hear a great liberal writer repeat this nonsense. The Allies will not destroy the German factories, and one cannot destroy seventy million people. One cannot ship a nation overseas, one cannot sterilize it. One cannot enslave a people, not even for the sake of justice, to punish them for their crimes and for the war. The second proposal, however, says: "Give the poor, misguided Germans their own freedom back again. This will induce them to create a much better republic now. They are innocent." Of course everybody agrees that the Nazi leaders should be punished individually by an Allied court. Not only twenty of them, but thousands. If one adopts the theory that a man who just carried out an order is not responsible, that would practically leave only one single culprit: Hitler, and even he would claim to have fulfilled an order given him by the Almighty.

In dealing with a nation of seventy million one does well to remember that we have had for nearly two hundred years, since Beccaria, a new philosophy of penal law. We do not punish for revenge. We confine a criminal for the security of society, but also to re-educate him and thus bring about his reform. This policy must be applied to the German nation. We can attain security for society by disarming the Germans; this must be done more thoroughly than ever before. It must be a disarmament so complete that not a single pistol would be left in the belt of a German policeman.

To create a new Congress or Reichstag in Germany right after the war is impossible. There are no liberals in Germany authoritative enough to lead such a body. To go back and create a liberal Germany, as most emigrants from Germany want to do, is likewise impossible. It did not succeed the first time. How can anyone think that after these new outbursts the Germans can become democrats overnight? Is there a democratic serum which one can inject and thus immunize a people against militarism, against desire for world domination, or

passion for submission to superiors in uniforms? Such a serum has not yet been invented.

Among the emigrants from Germany are sincere men, but there are others who are using their well-known names as a guarantee that a new liberal Germany will be created. Some of these wrote the most militaristic books during the last war, or prepared for 'revenge' against France under the disguise or rapprochement. Others merely want their old homes and former jobs back, or want to have positions in the new government. Still others were in the government during the Republic but failed to stop fascism.

Now they say that it was merely an adventurer who came along by chance, had success through general unemployment, and overthrew the peaceful German people. A former minister of labour on the Weimer Republic had had the nerve to declare publicly that the average German lad excels the American, at this very moment, when thousands of young Americans are being killed because the German people wanted its revenge. This he declared although he is a guest in America. The editor of a German socialist weekly in New York greeted the German prisoners of war in this country with a fervent editorial of welcome. Other labour leaders, during their official meetings, pretended to be governing Germany again. They don't know how dead they are.

In Germany, there does not exist a feeling for emigrants like in Russia or in Italy. Not one emigrant will ever find a political party or moral authority in Germany. Others are old militarists. Former Chancellor Bruening, quite an honest man, confessed deep admiration of Prussian militarism.

A very popular proposal to-day is the most stupid: "Tell the German people that we trust them, that they will be independent and free, if they get rid of their present leaders. Let them make their own revolutions, then welcome us as saviours, and let us all enjoy a happy ending!" What was the consequence of the corresponding proposal made by Wilson? He advised the German people to send away the Kaiser, to become free. The Kaiser fled, the generals escaped responsibility and left the shame of signing the surrender to some socialists and liberals. Not ten years later, but ten months afterwards, the beaten militaristic clique was strong enough to murder the leaders of the new Republic. Every German found his honour in building up a stronger nationalism, and the newly governing labour class had only one ambition: to prove itself as 'patriotic' as the rest. Not in 1933, but as early as 1919, the Republic was already being boycotted, and the new war was in mental preparation. A revolution which

is ordered, or at least advised, from the outside is just like a divorce into which a woman has to be persuaded by a friend. If she does not separate by inner forces, it shows that she still loves her strong husband. In the same manner, the Germans now love their strong leader, even if he betrays them.

* * * * *

I can see two possibilities for the future of Germany. One of them is that Germany becomes a communist state. That is possible. It is easy for a Hitler youth to change over from the Swastika to the Hammer and Sickle. For he does not bother about the philosophy that lies behind these symbols. All he wants, is a uniform and someone's command. Although Hitler's creed was not at all comparable to communism, all the same he has prepared Germany for communism by his acceptance of state socialism. Moreover, the German appreciates money less than command, and freedom less than order. All this would make it possible for communism to take over in Germany, much easier than in any other capitalistic country. Possible, yes; but not probable. And with the country occupied by a mixed army of Russian and western troops, I think the possibility can be ruled out.

A commission or committee of custodians should be set up in Germany, including representatives of all the United Nations. Not to invite representatives of the small nations bordering on Germany, on the grounds that they might first of all seek revenge, would be a mistake. It would justify the German idea of superior and inferior nations.

A strong United Nations army of occupation should take over all important places in Germany so that the people might learn, for the first time in 130 years, what foreign authority looks like. Only through foreign faces, foreign uniforms, foreign languages, foreign customs, can the Germans be made to understand that they have been defeated, which they flatly denied after 1918 because no victor ever entered Berlin. Nobody would be imprisoned or murdered without trial; but they would feel that the despised Poles and Czechs were not only their equals but their victors.

The different governments will have to punish all German war criminals, the military and the civilian ones. Jurists will have to decide which of the crimes were individual and which collective.

Some people propose to deliver the guilty to German judges. That is unacceptable. In 1919, the Germans signed an obligation that they would hand in nine-hundred war criminals—the Nazis of World War I. Later, German professors made a solemn protest against

this. They said that the old imperial government had to be protected. They did this in the same spirit which had made them back Belgium's invasion.

Under the pressure of Anglo-Saxon puritanism, which is at work again to-day, the Allies were weak enough in 1920 to renounce different rights of the Versailles Treaty. For instance, the trial of the war criminals was turned over to the German Supreme Court at Leipzig. The loyal impartiality of its well-known judges was trusted. What happened? The Supreme Court refused to accuse 888 men out of the list; they opened trial against twelve, and condemned six. Three of these escaped from prison after a few days, without being pursued. The last three of the nine-hundred accused were confined to prison for some weeks. That was what the world would witness to-morrow if it let the Nazi leaders be sentenced by their German countrymen.

Germany will have to rebuild all properties that were destroyed in foreign countries, whereby free use should be made of German labour, capital, and materials. All goods stolen by Germans in foreign countries and brought to Germany must be restored or replaced, as well as those taken from the victims of the Nazis in Germany itself. This will teach the German people a lesson, namely, that war is bad business.

Throughout Europe there have been irreparable losses through Axis and Allied bombings and artillery fire. More of them will be caused during the approaching German debacle. The same was done by Hindenburg in his retreat through France in 1918, it was done with vandalic intentions and without any strategic necessity. In the years of 1939-43 the Germans destroyed cathedrals, paintings, statues, libraries of unique value. This criminal destruction of the highest achievements of humanity should be expiated in part at least, through the return by Germany of the different countries' works of art which are still in its possession, from pre-war times or through robbery. For how could the world allow Germany to retain any Dutch or French or other works of art, after she deprived all those countries of their national monuments?

A couple of dozen German Nazi-victims from concentration camps, together with a few loyal immigrants, could be made to share in the Allied Occupation Government. But under no circumstances could there be another Reichstag with liberals and socialists, who last time became ardent nationalists. Watch-dogs who lay quietly asleep while robbers ransacked the house, should not be trusted a second time.



It is here that we can find the deciding difference between German and Italian mentality. The Italians can look back upon a tradition of democracy. For two thousand years, republics have flourished on Italian soil. In the nineteenth century the Italians fought forty years for their liberty. While the German liberals remained irresolute idealists, leaving it to Bismarck, the Junker, to create unity and their Reich, the Italians gained liberty through the revolutionary spirit of Garibaldi, Mazzini, Cavour. Mussolini interrupted a century-old tradition of democracy; Hitler made an end to a democratic intermezzo of fourteen years. Mussolini had no model for his Italian tyranny in modern times, and had to take his idols from the Roman empire. Hitler simply continued Prussia's three-hundred-year-old tradition of military autocracy. All parties and all classes in Italy can, therefore, recall their former liberties, and might yet produce a democratic leader for tomorrow. The Germans have no revolutionary name to remember, nor a liberal epoch to revive; the Weimar Republic, which never militantly defended itself, left nothing but contempt. That is why Italy will be able to govern herself after defeat, and Germany will not.

For centuries Italy has been the sufferer from the German mystic urge to dominate the earth. Possessing less wealth but the same density of population as Germany, the Italian people nevertheless did not desire the conquest of France, Switzerland, Serbia, or Greece. The desire to conquer and dominate lies deep in the martial souls of the Germans, to-day as in the time of the Goths and Vandals. The Italians fought wars for the expansion of their trade and for their freedom; the Germans, for conquest. The Italians endured their dictator; the Germans adore their tyrants.

In the hands of the peace-loving Italian people fascism over a period of seventeen years never became a world threat. But as soon as its seeds were planted into the war-loving German people, fascism became a menace.

The Italians, liberated from fascism, will not rise against their victorious liberators; but the feeling for revenge will be as ardent in German hearts in 1945 as it was in 1920.

It has been suggested that the German Reich should be dismembered and cut up into twenty or thirty pieces, making it what it was before Bismarck. Such a solution would run counter to the trend of our time. The nineteenth century witnessed the amalgamation of tribes into nations, and Bismarck's creation of the German nation was logical despite the errors which we can also notice in the emancipation of Italy, Greece, and other states.



But something else can be done with Germany. The destructive element in Germany comes from Prussia, and all the culture and constructive elements come from Germany's south and west. Therefore Germany should be partitioned, not into thirty pieces, but into two. Cutting off the whole north-east would create a Republic of Prussia with about twenty-five million inhabitants. In such a way, the Prussian General Staff would never again have the power to mobilize, by one declaration, the whole of Germany, as it did. This division would also break the economic power of the Junkers. For the last three hundred years or more, they have owned provinces of north-eastern Prussia, and these giant estates include up to 95 per cent of all the farms in the territory—a relation comparable to that of Standard Oil to some small oil firms. The complete expropriation of the Prussian Junker class will by itself destroy their privileges by cutting off their funds. On the small farms left to them they will have the opportunity to prove whether their fathers were farmers who brought up their sons to be likewise, or whether they were playing the great lords, squandering their money in Berlin while serving as officers in one of the exclusive guard regiments, and spending the summer months in search of new mortgages. The two groups in Germany which must be given the most thorough cleansing and after that a complete new orientation, are the Junkers and the professors.

The separation of Prussia should not be accomplished by order of the victors, but by a free plebiscite. The expected result, the isolation of Prussia, would thus come about by resolution of the people.

Prussia eliminated, the rest of the country should form a Federation. Neighbour provinces like Saxony could decide by the plebiscite to which of the two German republics, Prussia or the Federation, they wished to belong. Most probably they would vote for the Federation. Prussia always was disliked in Germany: the Rhineland people called themselves 'Muss-Preussen' (forced Prussians).

There are two advantages to this plan. Firstly, there would be a separation of the Lutherans of Prussia from the Catholics of the Confederation, both majorities. Secondly, a relation of two friendly neighbour-republics would result, similar to the one existing between the United States and Canada.

Austria, as agreed upon by Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin at the recent Teheran Conference, will once more regain her independence, and thus be outside the suggested Federation. Choice of government will rest with her peoples, but there can be no question of a re-installation of the Hapsburgs. While citizens of all nations were fighting

for their countries, the German and Austrian princes—with two exceptions—remained in their castles or married rich girls.

To-morrow a new League is possible, because now Russia and the U.S.A. are ready to enter. Germany also should become a member, to prevent her from nursing once more the arrogance of an outlaw who thinks he is a martyr. But she should be excluded from the operation of the League's perpetual international Air Force. It is better not to put a knife into the hands of a brute.

Germany should not be deprived of land which she held in 1933, perhaps excepting East Prussia. She should pay her debts to Europe not in the provinces, but by individuals. Every adult German, except the martyrs and active opponents of Nazism, will have to work until the destruction is repaired that Germany had brought upon the world.

The Germans should be permitted to function as a nation, but their weapons will have to be taken away from them, their education supervised, and they themselves will have to be placed under political guardianship. If this is not done—if there continues to be talk about the 'poor, misguided German people,' then, within twenty years, the democracies will have to fight their third war against Germany.

IV

THE GERMAN EDUCATED

"So, you have to limit yourself. To 'have to' is hard but it is the only way a man can show what is in him."

—Goethe.

A PART OF THE WORLD HAS BEEN EDUCATED BY GERMAN SCIENCE. Taine, the great historian, overcoming his French pride, said that about 1820 the Germans for some fifty years had been the intellectual leaders of the world. Kant had revolutionized thinking methods, Beethoven changed the mission of music, and Goethe was marvelled at, a microcosm as unique as Leonardo da Vinci or Bacon. Some arts and sciences were carried from Germany to other nations, where they were imitated and modified. Even though the Germans were never great colonizers, their scientific and artistic achievements have greatly influenced the world.

The nineteenth century adopted new fundamental thought brought

forth by German natural scientists. In the twentieth century, the Germans turned their theoretical knowledge to practical use, into discoveries in physics and chemistry. Newly discovered laws and theories were turned into lenses, cameras, serums, X-ray photographs. Specialists from the four corners of the world came to study in Germany, and with their newly acquired knowledge brought back home a veritable respect for German intellect. Especially in America, where practical application of theories is decisive, German achievements were admired, and most of all in the two fields of chemical industry and shipbuilding. When a few years after the German defeat the *Bremen* docked at New York harbour, she was considered a symbol of German craftsmanship and enterprise.

However, this creative attitude was overruled by the Germans' envy of others, and their inventiveness was surpassed by the indomitable ambition to rule the world. Instead of trying to win the world with their microscopes and synthetic colours, their musicians and sport teams, the Germans preferred to follow their age-old dream of military glory. When they again began to build war planes, tanks and cannon, their future course was decided.

One of their achievements in these four years of war is that the rest of the world learned their technique, copied their tanks and bombers and is now surpassing them in every respect.

This highly advanced people is now to undergo a new education. This is a very difficult, a problematic task. History shows that civilized nations after their defeat began to educate their victors. The education of victorious Rome by the subjugated Greeks and Christians is one of the most striking examples. Victors also became educators when they contacted natives and uncivilized peoples, or when, as in South America, a very high but antiquated civilization was confronted by new inventions and sciences used by the victors. The German case is quite different. One of the leading nations within the framework of our civilization, Germany has to be handled as a gifted but dangerous boy who must be watched and controlled by strict though well-meaning masters. This is a novel situation in history. How can it be tackled?

The Germans have just now shown to the world how things should not be done. True, they have conquered France, and with her the oldest civilization in the western world. They conquered Holland and Norway and other great nations, but did they succeed in subjugating these peoples? Not at all. The reason is that the French and Dutch and Norwegians are very much aware of their moral superiority. They knew that this conquest, this catastrophe which had befallen them would not last. They despise the victors and feel that this defeat,

this occupation, is nothing but an evil dream from which they will awaken soon. This gave them the power to resist without weapons and to decline reconciliation.

When the Allies enter Berlin this time, the fact of the definite German defeat will have been brought home to the German people so undeniably, that it will cause a fundamental mental shake-up. They will soon learn—and they may know it already—that drastic punishment will be dished out to some, but that after that, the victorious powers will neither rob nor suppress, but guard, guide and educate them. As the German by nature is obedient, not revolutionary, docile, and not anarchic like the French, there will be little revolt against the strangers who occupy their land.

But the success of the occupation and post-war relations depend upon the attitude of the occupation army at the beginning. One traditional attitude of the Anglo-Saxons will make it difficult for them in Germany, especially for the Americans. They are accustomed to treating a loser with attention and respect, trying to make him forget his defeat. The handshake which German soldiers denied their first English prisoners in 1914 should be a warning to you that the Germans have different ideas.

Soon after the Treaty of Versailles was signed, liberal authors tried to bring about an understanding and a policy of peace by admitting the war guilt of the former German government. But we were immediately attacked by our own countrymen and some of us were killed in Germany. Britons and Frenchmen who came to Germany with similar intentions were received with open distrust and hidden contempt. "They're nothing but spies," said the Germans. Since they do not believe in fair play, they cannot conceive of a victor in any rôle but that of a commander.

The only thing which the Germans admired of the British in Africa was their reserve toward the negroes. The fact that the French elevated coloured men to high positions aroused the disgust and opposition of the Germans. It is impossible for the Germans to conceive of any other state organization than the hierarchy of the pyramid, whereby each stone carries another stone, but rests its weight on one below. That a man should voluntarily give up a high position in this pyramid, no German will ever understand. An American who was in 1919 a soldier in the Occupation Army on the Rhine, told me the other day: "In the street-car in Cologne when I got up for two old ladies with my comrade, the whole car began to mock: 'Those fellows are supposed to be conquerors,'"

The German people will receive and regard the Allies as the

successors of Hitler. Who has won the battle—with sword and arrow in the time of the Teutons, with tanks and planes in our time—will be admired in Germany even though he will be the invader. But there is one thing he must avoid under all circumstances: cordiality and reconciliation.

Allied officers will not be seen promenading the streets of Berlin, swinging their riding whips, as German officers like to do in Paris. But it would be advisable for Allied officers to appear as often as possible in riding boots, by the help of which Herr Hitler won the respect of German youth. Riding boots were always considered the symbols of the master.

Allied officers will certainly not imitate Nazi methods. But they should put aside their ideas of comradeship and fairness while they are in Germany. If they don't, they will quickly be lost. If they show a soft hand, the deep-rooted force of German deceit would soon make itself felt. Encounters, conflicts and even murders would hamper fruitful work of the future.

There is only one way in which a foreign educator can treat Germans: as a master. The Anglo-Saxons have succeeded in treating their subordinates and servants politely without losing authority. No 'boss' in America shouts at his clerks—every boss in Germany does. In America in a factory, bank, petrol station, or State Department, orders are given in a normal, polite voice; in Germany the military tone of the drilling ground has penetrated everywhere. The judge, the teacher, the official: they all raise their voices in office, and the ordinary man likes it and feels that it just has to be that way.

When French officers came to Berlin in 1919, unfortunately not with their army! about a dozen of them tried to meet the Germans on a gentlemanly basis. They immediately fell into contempt. One of the few highly respected foreigners in Germany was the American banker, Parker Gilbert, because he remained aloof.

It is more important to secure the respect of the Germans than their sympathy. The Allies cannot count on their gratitude for services rendered or for obligations removed from them.

When Briand, as a gesture of good-will towards Germany, ceded to a request of the German Chancellor Stresemann and withdrew the French army from the Rhineland long before it should have been, Hindenburg staged a triumphal entry into the 'liberated' province and delivered a speech full of hidden threats against France. He was not able to say a single word of thanks to Briand. Everything that is conceded to a German will be taken over by him as if it had been withheld for much too long a time.

Anyone knowing the German character well can only give one advice to victorious troops entering Berlin: Don't keep smiling! The victor is the master, not the friend. The master does not smile—he orders. Whoever smiles loses the respect of the Germans. Respect he must command, because it is with authority that this nation can be governed, a nation in love with commands and obedience.

A man with a smiling face has no following in Germany. This is true not only for kings and ministers; even the musician when he bows to the audience after a performance, or the playwright when he appears before a curtain, puts on a sombre look. This brings him the sympathy of the audience.

Americans might have even greater difficulties in grasping this attitude, America being a land where a smile is the first condition of being photographed, where one does not say, 'I feel rotten,' or that one's business is far from satisfactory. The Germans, who are in love with tragedy, as we have seen, will obey their new masters if they see them driving through the streets silently, with serious faces, and sitting at their desks with a reserved attitude. It should become known that appointments with Allied officers or civilian administrators are not easily obtained. One should not follow the American way of open-mindedness and permit everybody to come in and see those in command. If a German finally is admitted to the office, especially one who has not been there before, the Allied representative should neither offer him his hand nor a cigarette. Such courtesies were never practised by a German superior. The foreign officer should never be cordial, but always reserved, cold and determined.

He will be respected if he uses the 'language of the victor'. He might try his German in shops or restaurants or when he wants to get some personal information, but never while on duty. He should not make it easy for those with whom he is to deal. Should he meet them on equal terms, the German, leaving the office, will say to his friend waiting outside: "A nice fellow; we'll be able to get our way with him." The Allied forces should behave in such a way that no German will say of them after three months, "Quite nice fellows." They should be 'unapproachable fellows'.

A gentleman who visited the German prison camps in America confirmed me in the fact that American officers who try to be cordial with imprisoned German officers are much less respected than those who always show authority.

Another important thing, one which may bother Americans, is that their officers will have to appear everywhere in uniform. It must be hammered into German heads that other nations also have uniforms

and weapons. This, in the German philosophy, means civilization. The official should not be seen in civilian clothes, and should he hold a civilian job, even then should he wear a uniform if he has ever been in the army.

Americans will not like these things. It is against their temperament to boss a man whom they have defeated. And yet this is the only way to make the Germans understand that they have been defeated, that this war is lost for them. Last time the German definitely denied that they had lost.

The German people must be given the spectacle of foreign officers and soldiers living and working in Germany. Their uniforms—the great symbol for the Germans—should be seen in every bus, theatre, hotel. They should become known as strict but honest men, not hurting anybody, not violating women, not pillaging shops, and not denying justice to anyone, but still living aloof, as is seeming for a class of masters. This will teach the German boy that there are other 'master races' in the world, and it will also make the adults understand this truth.

The victors may be generous in spending money. They should even be extravagant. The richer a man seems, the more natural it is that people in Germany would regard him as boss. Money ranks second only to the uniform as a symbol of power which the Germans will understand and accept. The individual Allied officer, soldier or civilian official should pay for everything, but the Command should never pay for anything they were authorized to ask for. If the Allied Command in Berlin should want to use twenty railroad cars for any purpose, they should order them, not bothering a bit about who is to pay for it or whether they are disrupting a rail-road schedule.

The last ten years have turned the German governmental system into one of the most corrupt. Nazi officials could be bought, for from one mark up to a million marks, according to their positions. The occupational authorities should insist upon the fulfilment of German obligations to the minutest detail—not more, and certainly not less. They should not give rewards of any kind for information received.

The foreign generals who are going to be Hitler's successors will be in a position to avoid such methods. The Germans will have to obey, and they will like to obey. But if these officers will keep up a high personal standard of living, if they will frequent the most expensive shops, live in the most expensive hotels, this will increase greatly their authority as governors.

One who knows German mentality will not regard things like that

as matters of secondary importance. They are very important because, as I have tried to explain in previous chapters, the Germans are forever concerned with what others think of them. No one will be able to educate them according to democratic ideals, which are foreign to them, if he treats them as equals.

The Germans will have to be delivered from the innumerable memorials to long forgotten battles and insignificant kings. Covering the country from one end to another, most of these monuments have not even artistic value. Street names reminding everyone of the Hohenzollern and other princes, and the Königsplatzes, Kaiserdoms, Tannenberg Squares, Sedan Streets—all of them must be eliminated. A Berlin 1920 almanack once helped me in figuring out that 60 per cent of all streets with proper names were called after kings, battles, generals and conquests; only 8 per cent were named after men of intellect. And it is just these intellectuals that were the great Germans, whilst most of the other names are unknown to the world. The national holiday of January 18th, anniversary of the foundation of the Prussian kingdom, should be changed to November 11, the birthday of the first German republic. August 28, Goethe's birthday, should replace Hitler's birthday as a national holiday.

For at least five years no German should be permitted to leave the country. After Versailles the Germans sent countless spies and agents to foreign countries, there to do underground work for the Reich. They financed these enterprises with money lent to them by the victors. Through these agents the erroneous idea of the so-called 'enslavement treaty' of Versailles was poured into the ears of millions of unprejudiced English and American civilians. When later Germany also received huge loans from the bankers of her enemies one could see the Germans racing their new automobiles down the highways of France, passing through sections ruined and demolished by German cannon, celebrating in the finest restaurants of Paris, while at the same time the French public was trying to economize in order to be able to reconstruct its devastated provinces.

One should always keep in mind that Hitler and his militarists have greatly enhanced the German belief in their own efficiency. German innate arrogance was thus greatly increased, and it was easy to convince the German people that their nation had been wronged and humiliated by the 'cruel' treaty of Versailles.

This should not happen again. They must be forced to see that they are the disturbers of peace. They must be taught to keep their tongues in check. They must stay at home because their presence is not wanted anywhere. Exit visas should be given to officials who have to attend

international meetings, to scientists who have important reports to make at a foreign convention, or to invalids and sick people who can prove that another climate might save their lives. No German salesman or bank brokers will be swarming over the world again, in search of new markets for their goods, and of new ears for their propaganda. This is not written to solve economic problems, but to discuss educational ones.

After World War I the loans given by Americans to German industrialists resulted in the paradox fact that the Germans again became competitors and rivals. This time it should be avoided. The first ten years, German industrialists should be forced to work according to Allied plans and orders, to re-establish what they have destroyed by their aggression.

Last May, in the official report on the conspiracy between three American companies and the German I.-G. Farben-Trust, the Attorney-General in Washington said that "the international cartels are not dead but are planning a continuation of their activities, now as well as in the post-war world." If public opinion or Congress, in America or in England, would support this International and give the Germans access to it, then the Second World War, too, will have been in vain. It would not only be the rescue of the guilty class of German industrialists; it would be a reward for them.

It is they who were the first to finance Hitler, before he came to power. They were the backbone of the fortification of armament, which openly aimed at war, at revenge, and at conquest. They, the Thyssens, the Schachts, the Schnitzlers, were the first ones to abandon the sinking ship in '43, when the defeat became visible. Von Schnitzler, president of the greatest trust in Germany, namely the Chemical I.-G.-Farben, this man is the brother-in-law of that same Field Marshal von Bock who was victorious in Russia and who to-day is still one of the most powerful generals.

After twelve years of perpetual war activities, von Schnitzler suddenly discovered that he detested his Nazi friends. He flew to Spain in his own plane, and now he plays the 'German refugee,' just like 2000 or more other German industrialists who, since the Italian and Russian defeat, have discovered their love for Alpine flowers, Swedish fjords, and the marble columns of Seville. These men, more detestable than the Nazis, because they never professed any conviction, are now in neutral countries, busy in re-establishing connections with their old Anglo-Saxon friends, who may try to save them in '43, to be able to resume business friendship in '44.

This industrial clan which ruined the Versailles Treaty and facilitated

German re-armament, should be taken care of this time. The power of all German leaders of industry must be broken. Not a single one of them should be allowed to renew his competition on the world markets. They are the same, or their sons, who after the first war betrayed the world by their inflation-trick, moaning about the enslaved nations, while they were enjoying the greatest boom in their time. For ten years no German machine or engine should work after the plans of the same Germans who for ten years worked for the enslavement of Europe. The orders should come only from a Committee of the Allies. They should say what is to be produced and for whom, and how much. The Germans will not be treated like slaves, as they do five million European workers. They will be paid, and will not be deported. But their fatal initiative must be broken. A victor anxious to 'save German industry' shows that he can only think in terms of money.

* * * * *

As music is Germany's greatest achievement, the new masters of the country should frequent concerts. The programme, to a large extent, should consist of German music, and for the moment, at least nobody should try to force foreign music upon them. The theatre should be left in German hands altogether. German literature is a vast reservoir. Thus the victors could show that they are well aware of Goethe's and Beethoven's greatness, and that they do not hesitate to honour the great minds which Germany has produced in the past. The German people would thus see that the Allies do not want to destroy German national life.

But, of course, press, theatre, screen will at first have to be under Allied censorship. The Allies should be liberal in all things which are not counter to the principal aim of their education. But an iron rod should be used to clean Germany of all pictures, busts, books, magazines, pamphlets, films and plays advocating race hatred, world conquest and nationalism—especially those showered upon Germany by the Nazis.

It was a great mistake of the German Republic in 1918 that they could not muster the courage to destroy radically all visible memories of the Hohenzollern, the monarchy, and the generals who had failed so completely. This lack of determination was taken by the people as a sign of weakness of the new government.

Among civilized nations one cannot resort to the barbarian technique of physical revenge, but one can undertake intellectual reprisals,

considering the peculiar kind of imagination the German people indulge in. All Nazi literature should be burned in great bonfires in the presence of the new German officials as well as the Allied protectors. It should be burned together with all books which have poisoned the German mind during the nineteenth century with their ideas of race superiority, glorification of war, and world domination. This would include books by Chamberlain, Bernhardi and Treitschke. On January 30, which commemorates Hitler's coming to power, there should be a solemn burning of his picture and his book, *Mein Kampf*. This should be accompanied by a reading in public of all the unfulfilled promises of world domination and glory he had made the German people. This reading should be done by Goebbels. On the other hand, all the books by those authors whose works were burned in 1933 should be solemnly restored to public libraries.

Every German imprisoned by the Nazis or held in concentration camps for political or religious reasons, everyone who can prove that he had the courage to stand up against Nazi crimes should be rewarded. Since the Germans are exceedingly fond of orders and decorations, the protectors should encourage the creation of new titles and orders for the heroes of the prison and camps. The title of 'Liberty Counsellor' ('Freheitsrat') would perhaps be adequate, and a decoration should be designed for those who have survived the concentration camps.

The German Republic did not create a hierarchy with badges and decorations, and the Germans painfully missed them. Hitler attracted his first followers by creating just such a hierarchy. How much they like their uniforms and decorations is illustrated by a recently captured German general who wore all his decorations even in the thick of battle.

Since all three old Reich flags represent political programmes that would again incite jealousy, Germany should be given a new flag; for an unaggressive Germany a plain white flag would perhaps be adequate.

Old German national songs, such as 'Deutschland über Alles' ('Germany Above Everything'), 'Heil Dir im Siegerkranz' (the Hohenzollern anthem), 'Die Wacht am Rhein' (The Watch on the Rhine), must be eliminated, together with the Hitler songs à la 'Horst Wessel'. The new German anthem could be taken from Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the 'Lied an die Freude.' The melody of this chorus is simple; new words can easily be written without changing a single note of Beethoven's music.

Should the Allied protectors decide to admit Germans with genuine democratic convictions, the foreign protectors should be most careful

in selecting them: the martyr is not always an efficient political leader; a German persecuted by Hitler does not necessarily become a peaceful European. The records of every man entering the protectorate government should be most carefully checked, especially in regard to his political activities during the time of the German Republic. There are quite a number of German liberals or socialists, some of them in America, offering their services in a new Germany. They belong to the group that stirred up the Germans after Versailles and are still speaking of the 'Slave Treaty'. Too decent to be Nazis, they are as nationalistic as they ever were.

The spots where German liberals might more easily be found are the city councils, which were the first to bring forth the germ of German liberalism and were the last to give it up. The socialist trade unions, well-meaning as they might have been, have not produced talents. The leaders of the Weimar Republic have never had, and certainly do not now have, authority among the people. They have deserted their posts without even an attempt to defend the Republic against the Nazis. Only in Austria the socialists fought—and lost. Masses do not forget such facts.

* * * * *

For the education of children, entirely different methods must be employed. Here we shall want sympathy, patience; here one may smile. The basic principle should be to lead them back to the great minds of their own history, and not so much awaken their enthusiasm for the glories of foreign democracies. This new education in Germany can be done by German books and German teachers—all the raw material for this great work does exist within Germany, but it is hidden in libraries which the Nazi hand has not reached, and in the brains of some silent thinkers.

German youth will not easily accept foreign ideas brought to them in books translated from a foreign language. It would be much easier to win them through art which their own fathers have created, honoured, collected, and left to them. This will appeal to them and counteract Nazi propaganda. There would be no shortage in books for this sort of education, as Germany is so rich in intellectual values. Goethe alone would be sufficient to re-educate his own people completely.

Children cannot be trained with the writings of Kant, but they can be made to accept liberal ideas out of stories and pictures, and in their religious education. Nothing more impressive can be given to

young people in order to alienate them from the Nazi teachings than the sermon on the Mount. After race doctrines have been instilled in them for years they should now be taught a history of tolerance. The first thing that must be radically destroyed in the minds of the growing generation is their belief that their own religion, their own race, their own nation is better than any other. It must be explained to those children that the State is not the centre of life, not an omnipotent idol clad in uniform, not a Moloch to whom the individual is sacrificed, but, as Americans see it, an organization to help and safeguard the individual.

The idea of tolerance and responsibility, two forces dependent upon one another, should be injected into them. This will make them acknowledge and even admire the ideas of other nations, and thus perpetuate and defend those of their own.

Though the right to vote must be suspended for some time, it should nevertheless be fully explained to the children as one of the most important rights a citizen can have. No longer should the German children be taught that it is the citizen's foremost duty to die for his Fatherland. They should learn that it is much better to live and think for it.

The children will be given relaxation out in the countryside. They will be taught farm life, forestry, fishing, boating, which the Germans love. The attraction that the big town offers to the youth everywhere in Germany can be easily diverted to the country, where young people are romantically inclined, and for that reason musical.

As an antidote against the insane race ideology they have been taught, German youth should be given the classic books of Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Lessing. Goethe's 'Iphigenie auf Tauris,' Schiller's 'Don Carlos' and 'Willian Tell,' Lessing's 'Nathan der Weise' are some of the plays which should be produced on the German stage and read in German schools. 'Nathan der Weise' especially should be known by heart, as it contains the very dogma of tolerance. Then, Herder should be read—the greatest scholar of German folk songs and the most notable translator of foreign popular verse.

A detailed programme for the education of the Germans cannot be given here. In any event, the more German art and poetry is taught, the more the children will be justified in being proud of their past.

Richard Wagner's 'Ring of the Nibelungen' should be banned from the German stages for at least fifty years. This seductive work has spread the German ideas of world domination more than the world is ready to admit. Around the year 2000 no musical ear will be able to stand this monstrosity, anyway. It takes up four evenings

of three hours each. Already to-day all great musicians abhor it, although they still have to play it.

The history of foreign nations has been taught in Germany as honestly as, for instance, in France. This was kept up until Hitler came into power; it should be continued along the same lines. National history, however, has always been taught distortedly; three-quarters of the material that has been taught consisted of wars and conquests and their glorification. Higher cultural aspects were served as dessert only. Princes were idolized. Important peace-time achievements were neglected in favour of military glory.

The German children should from now on learn a new history of their country, the double history which consists of Germany's conquests and wars on one hand and its intellectual achievements on the other. All the insignificant dynasties of the past, with their never-ending jealousies and differences between the royal houses, should be eliminated. But the advent and progress of the great evolution of intellect should be given much space. Instead of spending their time in memorizing the dates of battles and the names of kings, the German youth should study the lives of great German poets, artists and inventors. Comparisons should be made with other nations in regard to crimes committed by kings against their peoples, and the German failure to win liberty must be shown together with a background of the revolutions in other countries. The pictures of kings and generals which adorn the walls of every German classroom should be replaced by those of musicians, composers, writers, scientists. This does not mean that all kings should be defamed; those that have worked for progress and peace should be exemplified in place of those that waged wars. Thus the youth of Germany will slowly be led back into the rich domain of arts and sciences. They will come to admire the treasures of their own literature and music, and they will begin to hate the gang of adventurers who have withheld these riches from them.

With the solid knowledge of their own culture, they can be taught foreign literature and art. By comparing the great works of other nations with those of their own, the teachers will be able to awaken in their pupils a feeling of understanding towards other nations. A sort of biological outlook upon other people and countries may ripen in the maturing youth, which would enable them to look upon foreign countries and foreign ideas calmly and open-mindedly, and not with the eyes of would-be conquerors.

Sports must be given new dignity and should be exercised without the corrupting element of hate. From their very infancy, children

must be taught the element of fair play, as yet unknown to them. Just as the manufacture of arms and weapons will be forbidden, so the production of military toys like soldiers, guns and tanks. In such a way there will be few things to lead the youngsters' imagination toward war. They will have to learn to honour their new flag. Any insult against the flag, such as those inflicted upon the Republic flag after 1919, must be severely punished.

With the exception of teachers in foreign languages, which every German learns with great liking and talent, teachers in German schools must be Germans. It will be up to the Allied inspectors to control every single school and university, so nowhere and at no time there would be a breeding-place for new theories of revenge. Every teacher suspected of intellectual sabotage must be dismissed at once, and punished. Politics should not be excluded from the curriculum, but should be taught in special courses to children over fourteen. It is here that the Allies will have to show tact and initiative.

During the first years after the war, German children should be confined to their own country, just like their parents. Good students may later receive permission to visit other countries and may be given scholarships. A German boy returning from such a trip will be admired. Every one of his colleagues will want to go abroad. The German's character could wholesomely be influenced by a longing for something that should arouse his imagination; the trip abroad should be held out as a reward to the German student.

German universities will have to be reorganized, especially in view of the professors. It will take some time before the Teutonic ideal of honour expressed in beer drinking and sabre duels can be exterminated. Probably 80 per cent of all German professors will have to be discharged. There can be no excuse for a man who taught Nazi ideals; many of them did it long before Hitler. During the first years there will be thousands of German professors living on their pensions. But the millions spent for pensions are a mere trifle as compared to the harm these men could do if permitted to continue as teachers. They would claim to have been forced to teach the Nazi doctrines, and would promise to reform. Their record, however, is such that attention should be paid neither to their claims nor to their promises.

I believe that control and reorganisation of German schools and universities will be the most important task facing the Allied victors. Experiences of the Weimar Republic have illustrated that an educational system without the supervision of the victors will only lead back to

the old religion of national arrogance and, consequently, to new theories of revenge and war.

What should be done with the young men brought up by Nazi education, perhaps two million soldiers between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five? If they do not become communists, what kind of discipline could be applied? How could this unruly element be collected together and governed? They must be given a chance in order to find out whether or not they can co-operate. Some of them might yet be saved. Most of them will be lost and perish like the millions the Nazis sacrificed already. World progress must step over these two million men if it fails to reform them. The nation consists of seventy millions, and about eight of them are children. The younger they are, the more hope we have to win them.

The ideal of an educator is not to change a character but to develop it. Goethe, who had such deep insight into the problems of education that he even designed a whole 'pedagogical province' in his old age, thought that the ultimate aim of education ought to be the training of natural qualities into productive abilities. The Germans possess some natural qualities. Our task, then, is to stifle their evil instincts and to develop their wholesome characteristics.'

It is a fine task, and it deserves the attention of great minds.

APPENDIX

A MANIFESTO

FROM AN ADDRESS MADE OVER THE BLUE NETWORK, AUGUST 19th, 1943:

. . . Seventy million Germans are being told by Goebbels that they will be murdered, sterilized, or sold as slaves. That is why I believe that the most urgent thing to do to-day is to tell the German people what the Allies have in mind for them. Don't give them compassionate compromises, but the truth. Don't say to them that they are a poor, misled people; don't say to them that the Allies come as friends and liberators. This was possible and logical to say to the Italians, but not to the Germans. We should not say to them that they may now go on and build up their own free government. The German people only understand the voice of a victor or a lord. They would laugh at any humanitarian ideas and say: "That is a 'new Wilson'." They love to obey, even a victor. The manifesto I suggest may be changed on many points. Then it should be printed on leaflets and broadcast by strong voices in military German style:

"People of Germany ! The time has now come for you to understand that you are not the world's foremost people ! The Reich you were promised would last a thousand years, to-day, after ten years, lies partly in ruins. Instead of winning world domination, your armies are in retreat on all fronts. Your cities are under a disastrous bombardment by night and by day. Your Italian neighbour hates you and hates the war. If you force him to fight on your side he'll shoot at you !

"We ask you to surrender, to end a useless fight. We will occupy your country with our armies and maintain order. We will try to hinder natural individual acts of vengeance by your terribly humiliated neighbours. We bring you peace, bread and justice.

"This means exactly:

"One—The end of all war actions by both soldiers and civilians.

"Two—That you will receive food, as much as we have, after we have helped the nations subjugated by you.

"Three—A just order in contrast to all the crimes which your armies, with cool dauntlessness and against all laws, have committed upon all Europe.

"You, people of Germany, are all accomplices in these crimes. In the last free and secret election in 1932 you, knowing their programme and all their crimes, voted for the Nazis and made them the strongest party in Germany. By your own free will you brought to power a party which did nothing to hide its methods and aims. In plain democratic form the leader of the strongest party was nominated Reichs-Chancellor. Only thereafter he began his series of crimes against your constitution.

"For ten years not one section of the population rose against him, with the exception of a few courageous priests and working men. No party, no scientist arose against the crimes with which your Führer ruined the German name before the world. That is why we pronounce you guilty.

"But as we are not Germans it is not our intention to punish physically seventy million people. We will accurately examine the records to determine how many leaders are guilty. After a public trial we will punish them. With the millions we will do as one does under modern penal law. Instead of taking revenge, the penal law protects society by hindering the guilty from repeating their crimes and by trying at the same time to educate them.

"As we are not Germans, we will not kill or imprison anybody without a trial. As we are not Germans we will not violate women. We will not pillage your homes. All who are not personally guilty may follow their peaceful professions.

"But we will take from you all your weapons, your police will be under our rule. You have shown the world that you are not able to govern yourselves, therefore we will take over the government and govern with firmness and justice. No one who obeys our law and order will have anything to fear. We will also ask some of your most loyal citizens to advise us in government and administration. The entire educational system of your schools and universities will be under our control, but guided by German teachers in the German language. It will be based upon the principles and works of the great German poets and thinkers whom you have neglected much too long.

"People of Germany, surrender ! Refuse obedience to your present masters. Arise and give us a signal.

"This ultimatum is of short duration. If you continue to follow the criminals as you have done, partly by desire and partly by impulse,

then we will unleash the most terrible bombardment from the air; we will destroy your cities so that not one single house will remain.

“People of Germany, decide your fate!”

This is the kind of proclamation which would cause the Germans to lose their fear of becoming slaves when they surrender, but it would also acquaint them with the voice of a victor.

THE END

